

11.13.23

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON. N. J.

PRESENTED BY

The Widow of George Dugan, '96

Division.....

B5494

.L276

Section.....

v.12

copy 2

George Oregon



A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, REVISED, ENLARGED, AND EDITED

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

ASSISTED BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. XII. OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: CONTAINING JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

1899



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

LIBRARY OF THE
NOV 1 1892
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE
LAMENTATIONS
OF
JEREMIAH.

THEOLOGICALLY AND HOMILETICALLY EXPOUNDED

BY

✓
DR. C. W. EDUARD NAEGELSBACH,

PASTOR IN BAYREUTH, BAVARIA.

TRANSLATED, ENLARGED, AND EDITED

BY

WM. H. HORNBLOWER, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF SACRED RHETORIC, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN WESTERN THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, ALLEGHENY, PA.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
CHARLES SCRIBNER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District
of New York.

THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. NAME, PLACE IN CANON, LITURGICAL USE.

1. In Hebrew MSS. and editions this book is called הִיכָה, *i. e.*, *How!* from the first word in it (as Proverbs and the Books of the Pentateuch are designated by their initial words), which word also begins chs. ii. and iv., and thus appears to be a characteristic of the Book.* The Rabbins called it קִנּוּת, *i. e.*, *neniae*, dirges, *elegiæ*, elegies, lamentations. קִנּוּת is found in the Old Testament in 2 Sam. i. 17; Amos v. 1; viii. 10; Jer. vii. 29; ix. 19; Ezek. ii. 10; xix. 1, 14; xxvi. 17; xxvii. 2, 32; xxviii. 12; xxxii. 2, 16; 2 Chron. xxxv. 25. In Ezek. ii. 10 the plural form קִנּוּתִים is used, and in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25 קִנּוּת. The Septuagint always translates this word *θρήνος*, *θρήνοι*, whence are derived the Latin names *Threni*, *Lamentationes*, *Lamenta*.†

2. Since Josephus, *con. Apion*, I. 8, states the number of the books of Holy Scripture as twenty-two, and divides them into three classes, the first consisting of the Pentateuch, the second of thirteen prophetic books, and the third of four books which contained *ὑμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου* ["hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life"], it is evident that he included the Lamentations, not in the כְּתוּבִים [Hagiographa], but in the prophetic Scriptures, and hence that he appended it to the Prophecies of Jeremiah. The same classification and estimated number of these books are found in the canon of Melito (EUSEB. *Ecd. Hist.*, IV. 26), where the Lamentations are not expressly named, but are evidently reckoned with the Prophetic Books, as they are in the Treatise of Origen on the oldest canon (EUSEB., *Hist. Ecd.*, VI. 25), where it is said *Ἱερεμίας σὺν θρήνοις καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἐνὶ Ἱερεμίου*,—so also HILARIUS PICTAV. (*Prolog. to the Psalms*), RUFINUS (*Expos. Symboli Apostol.*), the Council of Laodicea, *can.* 60 (see HERZ. *R.-Enc.*, VIII., p. 199) EPIPHAN., *De mens. et pond. cap.* 22, 23 (*Opp.* II., 180, ed. Petav.), the canons of the African Synods of 393 (*Can.* 36, *Mansi* III. 924) and 397 (*Can.* 47, *Mansi* III. 891), AUGUSTINE (*De doct. Christ.*, II. 8) and by JEROME in the *Prolog. Galeat.*, where likewise the Lamentations are not mentioned, but are evidently appended to the Prophetic Book, for after the enumeration of the twenty-two books he says, "Some would include Ruth and Lamentations in the Hagiographa, and by adding these compute the whole number of books as *twenty-four*, etc."—Another method of enumeration and classification was gradually adopted by the Jews, the first trace of which we find in Vol. 4 of BEN EZRA, 4, 44, where the ninety-four (this, without doubt, is the correct reading) sacred books are divided into two classes of seventy and twenty-four books. The twenty-four books,

* [The word is especially proper as indicating the subject and tone of its contents. GERLACH.]

† [Syriac, Arabic and later versions bear similar titles.]

manifestly, are the canonical ones. The Talmud also, in the *Treatise Baba Bathra Fol.*, 14 b. enumerates twenty-four books, probably in accordance with the number of letters of the Greek alphabet, which was made to correspond with the Hebrew alphabet by adding to the latter the double yod, ם, that was used to express with reverence the name of Jehovah. The Talmud now reckons the Lamentations among the Hagiographa, which it arranges in the following order, Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra (with Nehemiah), Chronicles. The Masorites introduced a third modification, arranging the Hagiographa thus,—Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra. But only the Spanish manuscripts preserve this order. The German give the order thus,—Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles. This is the usual order in our Hebrew editions of the Bible. —In the Septuagint, the various recensions of which differ from each other, another principle of arrangement prevails. This depends generally on the distinction of the books into historical, poetical and prophetical, in which order they succeed each other. But Lamentations is added to the prophetical book of Jeremiah. The Latin versions follow the same order, both the Itala and Vulgate. The Council of Trent has sanctioned this arrangement, in *Decr. I., Sessio IV.*, where the Lamentations, without being mentioned, are reckoned with the Prophetical Book of Jeremiah. Our Protestant Bibles assign the book to the same place.

3. The Masoretic arrangement of the Hagiographa, in separating from the other books and placing together the five Megilloth [or festival rolls, which were appointed for rehearsal on certain feast and memorial days],—is purely conjectural. For not earlier than the Masorites do we find these five books placed together. The order of the German manuscripts is accommodated to the succession of holy-days. On this account the Song of Solomon comes first, because it was read at Easter; then follows Ruth (Whitsuntide); then the Lamentations. These were read on the ninth of Ab, on which day the Jews commemorated the destruction of both the first and second Temples. (See HERZOG, *R.-Enc.*, VII. p. 254).—As the Israelites have appointed the Lamentations for that great mourning festival, it is also a rule with them that an Israelite, when mourning a death, read no other book than Job and Lamentations. (HERZ., *R.-Enc.*, XVI. p. 364).—In the Romish Church, passages out of the Lamentations are read on the last three days of Holy-week. Three lessons are assigned to each one of the three days; the lessons are, on Maundy-Thursaday, I. i. 1–5, II. i. 6–9, III. i. 10–14; on Good Friday, I. ii. 8–11, II. ii. 12–15, III. iii. 1–9; on Saturday, I. iii. 22–30, II. iv. 1–6, III. v. 1–11. Every lesson concludes, by way of response and versicle, with the words, *Jerusalem, Jerusalem, convertere ad Dominum Deum tuum*, turn to the Lord thy God. (See *Officium hebdomadæ sanctæ, Separat-Abdruck aus Dr. REISCHL's Passionale. München, 1857. Die Charwoche in ihren Ceremonien und Gebeten, herausg. mit Gutheissung des bischöfl. Ordinariats, Speier, 1856. NEUMANN, Jeremias von Anathot. II., S. 486).* With reference to the musical execution of the Lamentations in Holy-week at Rome, see *Die Reisebriefe von FELIX MENDELSSOHN-BARTHOLDY, Leipzig, 1861, S. 166 ff. (Brief an Zelter in Berlin)*. In the Evangelical Church LUDEGUS and LOSSIUS have arranged passages of the Lamentations for Divine service during the solemnities of Holy-week, the former for the solemnities of the last three days, the latter only for the solemnity of the Sunday in Holy-week. And Nicolaus Selnecker has liturgically arranged the whole of the Lamentations in the German language (in his *Kirchen-Gesänge, 1587*), not for Holy-week, but for the festival of the Tenth Sunday after Trinity (the destruction of Jerusalem). Further on this subject, see SCHÖBERLEIN, *Schatz des liturg. Chor-und-Gemeindegesanges, II., S. 444 ff.*

§ 2. CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE.

1. The general subject of the Lamentations is the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. That this book is a *prophecy* of the destruction of Jerusalem, as Tremellius and others have asserted (see FÖRSTER, *Comm. in Thr.*, p. 5), is an utterly groundless opinion, which we mention only for curiosity's sake.* Similar Songs of lamentation, having for their subject

* [This assertion of *utter groundlessness* is rather strong. 2 Chron. xxxv. 25 and the declaration of Josephus (*Ant. B. X.*, ch. v. § 1) afford some ground on which to rest the hypothesis, that these Lamentations are the elegy written on the death of Josiah, and that they assumed the form of a prophecy of the utter destruction of the city, which Josiah might have pre-

the death of individual persons, or political catastrophes, occur in the Old Testament. See the citations in § 1, 1. But no lamentation of equal length and so artistically constructed is now extant. The peculiar structure which is common to all these songs shows that they all have one general subject. In Song I., the poet himself is the first speaker, vers. 1-11 *b*, whilst he introduces to us Zion [Jerusalem] * as an ideal person. He pictures here the sad consequences of the destruction, whilst he indicates the causes of the same (ver. 8). In the second half of the chapter (vers. 11 *c*.—22) the personified Jerusalem herself speaks, portraying her misfortunes under manifold images, explaining their causes and praying for help and vengeance. In Song II., in the first part of it, the poet himself speaks, (*a*) ascribing the destruction to the agency of the Lord (vers. 1-9), (*b*) depicting the consequences of the destruction (vers. 10-12), (*c*) addressing the object of the destruction, namely, the personified Jerusalem, expressing his grief, his opinion as to the causes of the catastrophe, and exhorting her to prayer (vers. 13-19). To this exhortation Zion, here represented by the wall of Jerusalem [Zion], responds in a prayer breathing the deepest and acutest sorrow (vers. 20-22). In Song III., which evidently forms the climax of the whole, the poet introduces as speaking *that man*, who in those troublous times had suffered more than all others, and consequently had attained, as it were, to the very summit of the common calamity, for he had suffered not only from the enemy what was common to all, but also from his own people and associates, a thing unheard of save in this particular instance. This sufferer was the Prophet Jeremiah. He does not name him, it is true, and it is evident that he has in his eye, not the person of the prophet merely, but rather the servant of the Lord as a representative of the (Ἰσραὴλ πνευματικὸς) spiritual Israel, yet all the particular features of this Lamentation are borrowed from the history of that prophet (vers. 1-18). This section ends with a cry of despair (ver. 18). But immediately the poet lets a morning twilight, as it were, succeed this night of despair, (vers. 19-21), which through the utterances of united believing Israel soon expands into daylight, beaming with the most radiant consolation (vers. 22-38). In what follows successively, the evening twilight gathers, and then the poem sweeps back into such a night of grief and mourning, that Israel begins to confess his sins (vers. 39-42), but then gives vent to lamentations on account of those sins (vers. 43-47), until finally, in the last and third part, Jeremiah again takes up the word in order to weep out his grief over Zion's misery and sins, (those sins which were likewise the source of his own misfortunes), and to implore the Lord, in beseeching prayer, for protection and for righteous avengement upon his enemies (vers. 48-66). In Song IV., the poem loses more and more of its ideal character. In the beginning indeed we find an ideal and well sustained description of Israel, as if it were the nobility of the nations, and then, further, of the princes of Israel, as the noblest among the noble, and then, appearing in sharper relief by standing out on such a back-ground, a delineation of the sufferings endured by those nobles (vers. 1-11); but in the second half of the chapter the poem becomes more prosaic: the chief guilt is imputed to the prophets and the priests, whose well-deserved punishment is then portrayed in the gloomiest colors (vers. 12-16). Then follows a description, graphic in the highest degree in spite of its brevity, of the events occurring from the extinction of the last gleams of the rays of hope kindled by the Egyptians, till the imprisonment of the king (vers. 17-20). The conclusion is a short address to Edom, which is ironically congratulated at the downfall of Jerusalem, while, at the same time, the punishment of its malicious joy is foretold (vers. 21, 22). In Song V., the style is almost entirely prosaic. For, with the exception of ver. 16 *a*, no poetical expression is found in the whole chapter, rather only a concrete graphic picture of the naked

vented by a thorough reformation, but which his partial reformation delayed for a brief time, only to make it the more tremendous when it did come. Therefore, if we assume that the Lamentations are the elegy which Jeremiah wrote on the death of Josiah, and especially if we assume that Jeremiah foresaw the inefficiency of Josiah's policy (see STANLEY'S *Jewish Church*), it would not seem strange that an elegy, written by Jeremiah, the prophet of the destruction, should be a prophecy of the destruction of the city, which now, on account of Josiah's death, was hastening all the more rapidly to its fearful conclusion. Nor is it in itself incredible, that the future should be presented in vision to God's prophet as distinctly as a picture of the historic past. While we accept Isaiah xl.-lxvi. as the production of the prophet who wrote the earlier portions of that book, we would speak only with respect of the opinion of those who see in the Lamentations a descriptive prediction of what was to come to pass, while we reject the opinion itself as, on the whole, untenable.—W. H. II.]

* [Our author uses *Zion* in the widest generic sense. Where the sense seems to require it, without changing his word, which would sometimes involve a change in his view of the meaning of the text, the distinguishing name is inserted in brackets, as above.—W. H. II.]

reality. The alphabetical acrostic is entirely wanting in this chapter. The whole chapter is intended as a prayer; for it begins and ends with words of petition (vers. 1, 19-22). What lies between is only a narration of the principal afflictions, which had befallen those who had been carried to Babylon and those who had fled to exile in Egypt (vers. 2-18). The concluding prayer expresses the hope that the Lord, who cannot Himself change, nor altogether reject His people, will bring them back again to Himself and to their ancient splendor (vers. 19-22).

2. As regards its *external structure*, the composition of this book, both as a whole and in its several parts, is so artistic, that anything like it can hardly be found in any other book of Holy Scripture. First of all it is significant, that there are *five* Songs. For the uneven number has this advantage, that the middle part of the whole Poem is represented by a whole number, and does not fall between two numbers, as it would in case there were an even number of songs [*i. e.*, the middle part of the whole poem is represented by one Song, and is not composed of parts of two songs]. By this means the prominence of the middle Song and, in connection with that, an ascent and a descent, a *crescendo* and *decrescendo* movement, with a clearly marked climax, is made possible. Thus it is manifest that the third chapter constitutes the climax. And this is truly and really so in two respects, both as to matter and form. As to the first, we have already shown that the first two chapters bear an ideal and highly poetical character. They constitute only the front-steps to the third chapter, which, externally, as the middle of the five songs and by its internal character, conducts us into the very middle of the night into which Israel sank, and then of the day which rose over Israel. For are not the frightful sorrows which the Prophet Jeremiah, the servant of God and representative of the spiritual Israel, had endured, and which rose at last to that terrible exclamation—*My strength and my hope is perished from Jehovah* (iii. 18), the expressions of the highest outward and inward temptation which can befall a true servant of the Lord? Here it should be observed that in iii. 1-17, there is no reference to God except as the author of those sorrows which are represented, on that account, as Divine temptations; while the name of God is not even mentioned till at the end of ver. 18, where, as the last word, with startling vehemence, the name “JEHOVAH” is pronounced. Here then we see the servant of the Lord, in the deepest night of his misery, on the brink of despair. But where exigency is greatest, help is nearest. The poet could lay up in his heart everything that he had against God, but he could not shut God Himself out of his heart. On the contrary it was proved, that after he had given the fullest expression to what he had in his heart against God, God Himself was deeply rooted therein. The night is succeeded by the dawn of morning, as represented in vers. 19-21. With ver. 22, breaks the full day. This ushers in with full effulgence the light of Heavenly consolation. Suffering now is seen to be the proof of God’s love. In this love, that suffering finds its explanation, its limit, and its remedy. As the pyramid of Mont Blanc, seen at sunset from Chamouny, its summit gleaming with supernal splendors, whilst below, the mountain has already disappeared wrapped in deepest darkness (See GÖTTE’S *Letters from Switzerland*, Nov. 4, 1779; Aug. 12, 1840), so, out of the profound night of despair and misery, this middle part of the third song and of the whole book towers upward, radiant with light. From this culmination point, the poet again sets out upon his downward track. Evening twilight follows the bright day (vers. 40-42) and passes into a night dark with misery (vers. 43-47). From the beginning of the section, so full of hope and encouragement (ver. 22), the poet speaks in the plural number, as if he would make it most emphatically apparent, that this was common property. He continues to speak in the plural number till after the beginning of the third and last part of the Song, when the night has begun again. Then once more (ver. 48), the poet speaks in the singular number. But he no longer speaks of those highest temptations, which were the subject of vers. 1-18, but of those inferior ones, which men inflict upon us. He treats of them also much more briefly; and from ver. 55 to the end of the chapter, finds relief in a prayer for help and avengement.—It is evident that this chapter consists of three parts. The first part includes vers. 1-21; the second, vers. 22-42; the third, vers. 43-66. The second part represents the culmination point of the whole book. It constitutes the point of separation between the *crescendo* and *decrescendo* movement. The latter continues in chapter fourth, in which the ideal and poetical sensibly subside, until at last in chapter fifth the style changes into plain prose.—With this artistic arrangement of the matter, the external form or structure cor-

responds. Every one of the five Songs has 22 verses, according to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, only in the third Song every verse is divided into three members, hence it has 66 (masoretic) verses. The first four Songs are acrostics. In the first two Songs the verses consist of three distiches. It has been usual to recognize four distiches in i. 7 and ii. 9, but improperly: for there is no fixed measure for the length of each member of the distich; and there are, therefore, in the places referred to, only three distiches, some lines of which are composed of a greater number of syllables than the others have. The third chapter shows by its external dress that it is the middle and climax of the whole. The three distiches of each verse (corresponding to three Masoretic verses successively) begin with the same alphabetical letter. The middle part, namely iii. 19-42, is still further distinguished, as the dome crowning the whole building, as follows: (1). Every verse-triad constitutes a finished whole with respect to sense [is one complete sentence]. (2). In vers. 25-39, each distich begins with the same word, or with a similar word (see Intr. to chap. iii.). (3). While in vers. 1-18, the name of God is mentioned only once, and then with peculiar emphasis at the end of ver. 18, *יהוה* in vers. 19-42 we read the names of God repeatedly, and so arranged that in vers. 22, 24, 25, 26 we have *יהוה*; in vers. 31, 36, 37 *יהוה* alternating with *אלהים* in vers. 35, 38, in ver. 40 again *יהוה* and at last in ver. 41 *אלהים*. Observe here, particularly, that *אלהים* occurs in the Lamentations only in the two places named above, and *יהוה* occurs only once, in the beginning of the *decrescendo* movement, ver. 58, whilst in chapter first it is used three times, vers. 14, 15 (twice), and in chapter second seven times, vers. 1, 2, 5, 7, 18, 19, 20. Chapter fourth is indeed an acrostic, but the decline of the poetical afflatus is indicated externally by the verses being composed of only two distiches. The solemn names of God *יהוה* and *אלהים* occur no more, on the other hand *יהוה* occurs three times, vers. 11, 16, 20. The fifth chapter indicates its relation to the four preceding ones only by the number of verses (22). The acrostic dress entirely disappears. The style has become prose. Yet the name of God *יהוה* is found three times in the words of prayer, vers. 1, 19, 21.

We have here only one other matter to remark upon, the question why in chapters ii., iii. and iv. *פ* is placed before *ע*. This is usually explained as a copyist's mistake. In fact some Codd. in KENNICOTT and DE ROSSI have these verses in their usual places. The Peschito also gives these verses in their proper alphabetical order. The Septuagint places the letters in their proper order in the margin, but leaves the verses themselves to follow each other in the order of the original. But this supposition of an error of transcriber is refuted, (1) by the fact that it is repeated three times, (2) by the impossibility of supposing that in chap. iii. three verses could have been transposed by mistake, (3) by the interruption of the sense which would result in chapters iii. and iv. [if the present order were changed]. If some Codd. and Versions have the letters in their right order, this is evidence of revision and correction. Others (as RIEGLER) explain this irregularity as merely arbitrary, others again (BERTHOLDT) as the result of forgetfulness on the part of the author. GROTIUS holds the singular opinion that the order in chapters ii., iii., iv. may be that of the Chaldaic alphabet, and therefore that Jeremiah in chap. i. "speaks as a Hebrew, in the following chapters as a subject of the Chaldeans." THENIUS would explain the alphabetical difference by a diversity of authors, but the unity of the plan, already proved above, and the unity of the language used, which will be proved in § 3 (to which also belongs the threefold *אֵלֶּה* at the beginning of chaps. ii., iii., iv.) contradict this most decidedly. EWALD is (even still in his Second Edition, p. 326) of the opinion that the *ע* in chapter i. "might have been transferred to its own place by later hands." But this would be a manifest interruption of the connection: for ver. 16 is directly connected in the closest manner with ver. 15 by *עַל כֵּן* therefore, [*עַל-אֵלֶּה*, for these things?], whilst ver. 18 [17?] begins a new thought. The liberty which the older poets especially allowed themselves in pursuing the alphabetical order (see Ps. ix., x., xxv., xxxvii., cxlv., and KEIL in HAEVERNICK'S *Introduction to Old Testament*, III., p. 50) are manifold [See BARNES' *Introduction to Job*, pp. 44, 45]. Whether they were influenced in this by a then prevailing diversity of method in respect to the succession of the letters, is not yet by any

means sufficiently ascertained, but is nevertheless the most likely explanation of that liberty. See DELITZSCH on Ps. cxlv., p. 769.*

§ 3. AUTHOR AND TIME OF COMPOSITION.

1. That the Prophet Jeremiah was the author of this book, not only is an old tradition, but has been maintained by the majority of commentators up to the present time. Yet there is no canonical [Scriptural?] testimony for it. For neither in the later books of the Old Testament, nor in the New Testament, is Jeremiah ever named as the author of Lamentations. There is not in the above named parts of the Holy Scriptures a single quotation from the Lamentations. The passage in James i. 12, which is appealed to, has only a very general resemblance to Lam. iii. 26; and as regards Zech. i. 6, the expression עָשָׂה יְהוָה כְּאֲשֶׁר זָכַר [*Jehovah hath done like as He purposed*] is not specific enough, and if it is a quotation could refer to Jer. li. 12, as well as to Lam. ii. 17. But the Alexandrian translation has preceding i. 1, these words, καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐρημωθῆναι, ἐκάθισεν Ἱερεμίας κλαίων καὶ ἐθρήνησε τὸν θρήνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ εἶπε. ["And it came to pass, after Israel had been carried away captive, and Jerusalem was become desolate, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said."] The Vulgate also has these words, except that in place of the simple καὶ εἶπε [and he said], it has the words, *et amaro animo suspirans et ejulans dixit* ["and with a sorrowful mind, sighing and moaning, he said" (DOUAY)]. The Arabic gives exactly the words of the Septuagint. The Targum Jonathan begins with the words, *Dixit Jeremias propheta et sacerdos magnus* [Jeremiah the prophet and chief priest (? דִּבֶּר אֶתְּ הַנְּבִיא הַגָּדוֹל)] said]. Josephus in the Antiq. Jud. L., x. c. 5, § 1, after he has spoken of the death and burial of King Josiah, says, Ἱερεμίας δ' ὁ προφήτης ἐπικήδειον αὐτοῦ συνέταξε μέλος θρηνητικόν, ὃ καὶ μέχρι νῦν διαμένει ["and Jeremiah the prophet composed an elegy to lament him which is extant till this time also" (WHISTON'S *Josephus*)].† THENIUS is of the opinion that this asserts only the existence of the elegy on the death of Josiah composed by Jeremiah, and has no reference at all to the Lamentations. But I believe that THENIUS here is in error. For the words of Josephus cannot be translated *the (solemn) elegy on Josiah*, because in that case it must have been called τὸ ἐπικήδειον αὐτοῦ [*the elegy on him*]. We can only translate thus,—Jeremiah composed as an elegy on him a lamentation song, which is still extant. To call it τὸ ἐπικήδειον (*the elegy*) would imply that the poem then existing really belonged to the species "*elegy*," that is to say, it possessed all the peculiarities of such a poem and was manifestly the *solemn* [elegy] on the deceased king Josiah that the customs of the times demanded.‡ But the absence of the article marks the still

* [GRELACH: Intr. pp. 9, 10: "The general remark 'that the Poet strictly confined himself to the external form, only so long as the thought accommodated itself to it without artificiality' (KEIL, *Eint.*, S. 378; b. HAEVERNICK, III. 58), does not suffice, . . . for the evident ease with which the Poet elsewhere manages the Form, [shows] that another arrangement of the alphabet would have had no difficulties for him. And how little the observations which NEUMANN (S. 490, 508) makes in the way of explanation, contain an explanation in reality, may be shown by his remark on ii. 16, where he says, 'Let us only reflect on the difference between פֶּה mouth, and עַיִן eye, and we here at least comprehend the transposition, where the mouth is the exulting mouth of God's enemies, the eye—God's watchful eye over the life of His people.' That could only be the real meaning if the following וְ-verse treated of God's eye watching for the protection of His people; on the very contrary, it does treat of the execution of punishment. But in view of the unsuccessful results of the special and repeated attempts to throw light on the darkness of this anomaly, the author must close this part of his preliminary discussion with a *non tiquet*."]

† [The literal translation is, "Jeremiah the prophet composed an elegy on him, a lamentation song, which is extant now." The words "a lamentation song," so obviously superfluous, suggest the question, whether the words καὶ συνέταξε, or words of similar import, may not once have preceded μέλος θρηνητικόν, and been dropped out on a presumption of error by those who took for granted that all Jeremiah wrote still survived? This would suit what immediately follows, which consists of an account of Jeremiah's writings.—W. H. H.]

‡ [THENIUS: Josephus "only said, that Jeremiah had composed *the (solemn) elegy* [funeral-poem] on Josiah, and that this was still extant in his (Josephus') time; how and where, whether in writing or in the mouth of the people [by oral tradition] he does not say, and least of all does he say that he finds that particular dirge (the *singular* number should not be unobserved) in the כְּתָב [Book of Lamentations]; had he believed *this*, since he adhered almost exclusively to the version of

the LXX., he would have surely added to διαμένει [is extant] the words ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις [in the Lamentations]. The strongest point in this argument is, not the interpolation of the definite article, to which Dr. NAEGELSBACH justly takes exception, but the fact that Josephus not only fails to say that this dirge is extant in the *Book of Lamentations*, but speaks of it only in the *singular* number as "a song of lamentation" (μέλος θρηνητικόν). We can account for this only, by supposing that he regarded the five songs as essentially one, and that having already characterized it as a *lamentation song*, he could

extant μέλος θρηνητικὸν [song of lamentation] as not necessarily belonging to the species "elegy," but only as a μέλος [song] which had served as an elegy. This admirably suits the Lamentations, which indeed contain not a single syllable referring to a dead king. Add to this, that Josephus in the same chapter, after he had related the death and burial of Josiah, seizes the opportunity to give a short notice of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and of *their writings*. For after the words quoted, he proceeds thus, "This prophet also predicted, and left [those predictions] in writing, the calamity that was coming upon the city, and truly as well that destruction which has in our days come upon us, as the Babylonish captivity. But not only *he* foretold such things, but the prophet Ezekiel, who first wrote and left behind him two books concerning these things." However we understand the somewhat obscure words concerning the writings of Ezekiel, this much at least is evident, that Josephus intends to give here a brief notice of the writings of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel. And so he says, Jeremiah has left behind him two writings, a lamentation song and prophecies, Ezekiel has likewise left behind him prophecies, and truly in two books. THENIUS says, if Josephus had meant our Lamentations by that μέλος θρηνητικὸν [lamentation song], then he would have written ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις [in the Lamentations]. But I maintain on the contrary, that if Josephus meant the θρήνοι [Lamentations] by the μέλ. θρήν. [lamentation song], the addition ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις [in the Lamentations] was not necessary [see note, p. 6.—W. H. H.], but if he intended to say what THENIUS makes him say, then he would have written οὐκ ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις [not in the Lamentations]. For since Josephus in this place speaks, not only of the elegy on Josiah's death, but likewise of the writings of Jeremiah generally, and since in his times our Lamentations were already regarded as a writing of Jeremiah's, as we know by the superscription of the Septuagint, he should, not to be entirely unintelligible, expressly declare that he did not mean by *this μέλος θρηνητικὸν* [lamentation song] which Jeremiah had composed on the death of Josiah, the θρήνοι [Book of Lamentations]. Since he has not done this, every one who knows that there are two writings in the canon which are referred back to Jeremiah as their author, must understand the words of Josephus as intended to designate those two writings extant in the canon. According to this, therefore, Josephus regarded Jeremiah as the author of the Lamentations, in which he, as Jerome did (Comment., Zech. vii. 11), recognized the elegy on Josiah mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25. Among the moderns, USHER, J. D. MICHAELIS (on LOWTH *de sacr. poes. Hebr. Not.* 97, pp. 445 sqq.), and DATHE (*prophetæ maj.*, ed. 1) shared this opinion, but both the latter receded from it (see *N. Or. Bibl.* I., 106, and DATHE *proph. maj.*, ed. 2). The Talmud also regards Jeremiah as the author of Lamentations (*Baba batr.*, Fol. 15, Col. 1), *Jeremias scripsit librum suum et librum regum et threnos* [Jeremiah wrote his own book and the book of Kings and the Lamentations]. This is the opinion also of the church fathers, all of them, (see ORIGEN in EUSEB. *hist. eccl.*, iv. 25, JEROME in PROLOG. *galeat.*, and on Zech. xii. 11) and of later theologians. The learned and whimsical HERMAN VON DER HAARDT, in a Programme in which he announced a commentary on Lamentations (*Helmstädt*, 1712), was the first to deny the authorship of Jeremiah ascribing the book to Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and the king Joachin, assuming that each one of them had written one chapter. Later, the unknown author of an Essay in the *Tübingen Theol. Quart.*, 1819, Part 1,—afterwards, though only in the way of conjecture, AUGUSTI, in his *Intr. to the Old Test. Scrip.*, p. 227,—and again CONZ in BENIGEL's *Archiv*, IV. pp. 161, 162, 422 sqq.,—express themselves as against the authorship of Jeremiah. KALKAR also in his commentary (*Hafnia*, 1836) thinks it suspicious that the Book so long retained its place among the Hagiographa and that the Greek version of it differs so much from that of the prophetic book, although he will not allow that those circumstances are decisive, as in fact they are not. EWALD, who in the first edition of the *Poetical Books of the Old Testament* (1839, V. 1, pp. 139 ff.) in no way impugned the traditional opinion, has since (GESCH. *Isr.* IV. S. 22 ff.; see JAHRB. *für bibl. Wissenschaft*, VII. S. 151; *Poet. Bücher*, 2te. Aufl. I. Th. 2te. Hälfte., p. 321 ff.) expressed his opinion to this effect, that 'Jeremiah's authorship, with nothing to prove it, may be regarded as impossible on the ground of the language alone.' He believes that the

not add that this Song was found (ἐν τοῖς θρήνοις) in the *Songs of Lamentation*, without seeming to specify one single Song of the five as separately and particularly intended. THENIUS in his quotation of Josephus omits the word θρηνητικὸν (16th Ed., Leipzig, 1855, p. 116), and seems to have wholly overlooked it.—W. H. H.]

author was probably one of Jeremiah's disciples, "BARUCH or some other." BUNSEN also [before EWALD] ascribes the authorship to BARUCH (*Gott in der Geschichte*, I. S. 426). THENIUS announces the opinion in his commentary (10te. *Lief. des kurzgef. exeg. Hdb. z. A. T.*, 1855, § 3 der *Vorbem.*, S. 117,) that chapters ii. and iv. are indeed by Jeremiah, but the other parts proceeded from other authors. He combats the argument drawn from tradition, and whilst he infers from the difference between the proëmium of the Septuagint and that of the Vulgate, that there was a Hebrew original, he also infers from the absence of the same in the Hebrew Codd. that the Jews doubted its genuineness, and thus he accounts for the transposition of the Lamentations to the Ketubim [or Hagiographa]. He contends further, that the traditional opinion is not confirmed by the subject-matter, spirit-tone and language, or by the character of unity in the Book itself.* He finds it highly unlikely that Jeremiah should have treated of the same subject *five times*.† He says further, "It requires only a very ordinary degree of æsthetical sensibility to distinguish the difference between Odes ii., iv., which are really fine, unconstrainedly animated, methodical and natural in arrangement and succession of ideas, and remarkable for their simplicity, and the dissimilar and weaker Songs, i., iii., which, whatever excellence they have in other respects, are hampered with the external form, in many ways artificial, here and there heaping up images and confusing them together and losing themselves in reminiscences of the past." To this he adds, that i., iii., v., among other things, record circumstances in which Jeremiah had no part. Finally the fact, that in ii., iv., the verses beginning with *ו* precede those beginning with *י* is only explicable by assuming a diversity of authors. Agreeably to these sentiments, THENIUS ascribed chapters ii., iv., to Jeremiah, as already remarked, but is of the opinion that chapter i. was composed "some time after the destruction of Jerusalem, by one who had remained in the land, and who at least was acquainted with chap. ii.;" and that chap. iii. was composed, also by one remaining in the land, shortly before the last deportation. He regards Song V., finally, as "the entirely disconnected poetry of a man there [in the land] who was probably a leader of a crowd of nobles, who having refused to join the expedition to Egypt, wandered about everywhere seeking a safer place of refuge."‡ These arguments of THENIUS have no matter-of-fact foundation, and cannot therefore be convincing.

As for me, formerly I was so convinced that Jeremiah was the author, as to declare this conviction in the article "Lamentations of Jeremiah," in HERZOG's *Real Encyclopædia*, and even in various places in my exposition of Jeremiah. But my conviction has been shaken on more accurate examination by the following matters of fact. 1. The tradition originates from the testimony of the Alexandrian translation. But on what does this testimony itself rest? We are compelled to ask this question, for the authority of that translation is by itself an entirely insufficient foundation. It is possible that the Alexandrian translator had predecessors in his opinion. But no evidence of that nature has come to us.§ It is further possible that he, or his

* [GERLACH: "The grounds of EWALD's opinions [as to the authorship] are only philological; but how venturesome it is to attempt to decide on such grounds alone, is shown by a comparison between THENIUS and EWALD; the former of whom, on philological grounds—those very grounds the perception of which may belong only to 'an æsthetical sensibility thoroughly practised'—imputes chapters i., iii., v. to another author than the author of chapters ii. and iv., which he leaves to Jeremiah; whilst EWALD, and truly in our opinion with entire correctness, remarks, that 'all these five songs, in the structure of their language, and in their rhetorical and poetical characteristics, as well as in thought and doctrine, and also in their historical allusions and descriptions, have a similarity so complete, that every competent judge will ascribe them to only one Poet.' (*Bibl. Jahrb.*, VII. S. 151. Comp. *Dichter d. A. B.*, 3d Aufl., S. 325 f.)."]

† [GERLACH: "Against the authorship of all five Songs by Jeremiah, THENIUS again raises a general objection in the question, whether it were probable that Jeremiah had treated one and the same subject five times. But if, according to his own declaration, the treatment of the same subject twice over has 'nothing strange in it considering the extraordinary character of the event lamented,'—then this objection to the five Songs appears all the more trivial when it is found on examination, that each Song treats of the common subject from a different point of view. * * * But this objection is entirely destroyed by the acknowledgment, arrived at from most different stand-points, of the 'internal, organic connection' (KEIL) of all five Songs, of which statement EWALD especially has made great use (*Bibl. Jahrb.*, VII. S. 152; *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1863, S. 334 f.; *Dichter des A. B.*, 3d Aufl., S. 323)."] GERLACH adds in a note, that with the proof of this "internal, organic connection" between the five Songs, the various attempts to assign the composition of the Songs to different times, or to bring them into different arrangements, must fall to the ground.—W. II. II.]

‡ [GERLACH, with reference to THENIUS' theory concerning Song V., says, "It is difficult seriously to discuss the possibility of such conjectures in order to prove them: THENIUS has not even attempted the proof and has thus spared those who come after him the trouble of refutation."]

§ [The evidence may not be satisfactory to Dr. NÆGELSACH, but he should not say so absolutely that there is "no evi-

predecessors, or both, derived that opinion from the book itself. For it is easy to suppose that the prophet, who had himself lived to see Jerusalem's fall, should write upon it an appropriate dirge. This was more likely to be supposed since this prophet had formerly been acknowledged as a composer of dirges (2 Chron. xxxv. 25). Moreover, how could a tearful song over Jerusalem's downfall fail to be expected from that prophet who had said, "Oh, that my head were waters, and mine eye a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!" (viii. 23). Add to this, that in chapter iii. the poet seems to identify himself with the prophet, and that the undeniably obvious and sympathetic harmony with the prophetic writings of Jeremiah seems to confirm that identity. The probability, therefore, that Jeremiah may have written a book of this description, cannot be denied. But how stands it with the evidence which the book itself, in ch. iii., seems to give in regard to its author, and how with the harmony in the way of thought and language? As for the internal evidence of ch. iii., in the first and third parts of that chapter the prophet Jeremiah certainly speaks. But the question occurs, whether he speaks as the author, or whether the author makes him speak? Either is in itself possible. For since the author in i. 11 makes the personified Zion speak, he may likewise in ch. iii. make the prophet Jeremiah, as the representative of the Ἰσραὴλ πνευματικός [the spiritual Israel], speak. But, on the other hand, since in ch. ii. the author is the speaker and there speaks of himself in vers. 11, 13, so in iii. 1-28, 48-66, the author may be the speaker, and according to the purport of the contents, he is speaking of himself. But here two things are to be taken into account. The first is this, that ch. iii. (see the exposition) constitutes the middle and climax of the whole book. Here the artistic construction reaches its highest pinnacle, and the prophet speaking in the first and last of the three parts, forms with his mournful lamentations the background for the bright and consolatory section contained in vers. 22-42. Is it now likely that Jeremiah would thus have made his own person the middle-point of the poem and would have done this with so much art? To me this seems not likely, even though it is assumed that the prophet speaks here in the name of the whole Jehovah-faithful Israel. Jeremiah, who was so modest and humble, would at the most have let his personal sufferings appear, if at all, only as an element or constituent part of the suffering which the faithful Israel had to suffer in common. But it does not seem like him thus to place his own person in the foreground as he does in that section which begins with "I am the man," iii. 1. In regard to the artistic construction, I have already in the Introduction to his Prophecies (§ 3), confessed that Jeremiah's style is not deficient in art. See for example his second discourse, chs. iii.-vi. But this refinement of art, this acrostic, this adroit periodic versification, these ingenious transitions in iii. 19-21, 39-42, this *crescendo* and *decrecendo* movement resting upon

dence." The bare fact of the existence of the words referred to in the Septuagint, a translation on the whole so faithful, and made by Jews who almost superstitiously venerated the written word and scrupulously adhered to Hebrew originals, is some evidence, constituting a probability at least, that the Septuagint copied these words from Hebrew MSS. Then again the grammatical structure of the sentence suits the assumption that it is a translation of a Hebrew original. The general agreement of the Vulgate with the Septuagint and yet the difference between the two, would indicate that the Vulgate is not a mere copy of the Septuagint, but obtained the words from an independent source. Even THENIUS is satisfied with the evidence that these words must have had a Hebrew original, and feels it incumbent upon him to explain why they are not found in our existing Hebrew Bibles. GERLACH: "Whether the Vulgate derived that introduction from the LXX., the [additional] words being added or having fallen out of the text of the LXX. [since the Vulgate was written], or whether both, independently of each other, reproduced a note found in their manuscripts, is of no importance, since the grammatical construction of the words in either case refers to a Hebrew original, which preceded both. In this, to be presumed Hebrew original, we have to recognize the oldest tradition concerning the author. But that this [superscription] was not accepted by the editors of our received text, cannot be explained with THENIUS by the assumption, 'that it was not regarded as satisfactory, that those editors were doubtful at least whether Jeremiah had composed the first song,—for that immediately follows after καὶ εἶπε [and he said].' Since this superscription could have no other object than to connect the Lamentations with a preceding writing (see the καὶ ἐγέμετο κ. τ. λ. [and it came to pass, etc.]), and that writing could only be the prophecies of Jeremiah, after which a part of the Jews placed them, then the absence of the superscription in those manuscripts which place the Lamentations among the Hagiographa, is self-explained and nothing less than proper."—W. H. II.]

* [Had he done so he would have violated no rule of good taste or propriety. He could, moreover, without charge or egotism, direct attention to himself, because he was the prophet of Jehovah and the representative of pious Israel and in his sufferings a representative of the Prophet of all prophets and the Head of Israel. But, in fact, there is not a word in the whole chapter, that any good man might not have written of himself without a breach of humility, and in "the brightly-shining comfort-section" (vers. 22-42) Jeremiah hardly alludes to himself at all. That part is not in the first person, but in the third person, and is not personal to the prophet, but passes beautifully and modestly into general truths of universal application.—W. H. II.]

the five-fold division of the whole poem—truly all this seems not like Jeremiah. In his writings nothing similar to this is found.* Would any one ascribe the most perfect product, in regard to the external artistic structure, of the Old Testament Scriptures, to that same prophet whose style is elsewhere characterized as *sermo incultus et pæne subrusticus*, if indeed one pauses to recognize his style at all, and does not rather direct his attention to those *rerum cælestium mysteria* which are concealed under the *sacramentis literarum*? Nevertheless, I freely grant that neither the psychological, nor the rhetorical argument can, by itself alone, claim to be decisive.

But another argument must be added to these, namely, Secondly, The prevailing character of the language in the Lamentations. This differs very considerably from that of the prophetic book. Although the author of Lamentations has much in common with that prophet, not only in general as a Hebrew writer, but also in particular by a designed reference to the writings of Jeremiah, yet on the other hand, he has so much that is peculiar to himself, and so much that Jeremiah has not at all, or has only in a different form, that it is difficult to believe in the identity of the two. I have spared myself no trouble to compare every word of the Lamentations (with the exception of such as are constantly recurring, as *הָיָה*, *אֵשׁ*, etc., without which Hebrew cannot be written) with the writings of Jeremiah. I have availed myself for this purpose of the Concordance of FUERST, and have found the same correct and to be depended upon, with the exception of what is given in respect to the word *אֶרְנִי*. The following is the result of this painfully laborious comparison, wherein I refer in every instance for authentication to the exposition of the passages in which the words occur.

[NOTE.—The bearing of the argument to be derived from the verbal differences, between the Prophecies of Jeremiah and the Book of Lamentations, is critically examined in the Appendix to this Introduction. The writer of this note, unwilling to insert his dissent from the very learned and conscientious author of this Introduction in the text of these pages, and unable to condense the reasons for his dissent in notes at the bottom of the pages, would here refer the reader to the Appendix, for a general summary of arguments in confirmation of the opinion that Jeremiah was the author of the Lamentations.—W. H. H.]

CHAPTER I. Ver. 1. The phrases *עַם רַבָּתִי* and *ר' בְּנִיִּים* occur only here. The singular *שָׂרָה* as an appellative, only here. *כְּרִינָה* is not foreign to Jeremiah's times, but is never used by him. *הָיָה לָמָס*, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 2. *לָחִי* never in Jeremiah. *אֵין מְנַחֵם*, only in this chapter, vers. 2, 9, 16, 17, 21, and in Eccles. iv. 1 (although the Piel of the verb *נָחַם* occurs in Jer. xvi. 7; xxxi. 13).—Ver. 3. *עָנִי* five times in Lamentations. Jeremiah uses neither it nor the root *עָנָה*. See iii. 33: v. 11. For *עָל רַב* Jeremiah says *בָּרַב* or *עֲבָרָה*. *קִנּוּ עֲבָרָה* (Jeremiah says *מְנִיחָה*), *מְעָרִים*, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 4. *אָבָל* never in Jeremiah. *מוֹיָעַר*, which occurs in Lamentations six times, and always in the sense of a time or place of a festival, is found twice in Jeremiah, but both times in the general sense of *tempus fixum*. The expressions *כִּי שָׂאִים* (see vers. 13, 16; iii. 11), the termination *יָן*, the verbs *אָנַח* (see vers. 8, 11) and *נָחַ* (four times in Lamentations) never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 5. *הִלַּךְ שָׁבוּ* is peculiar to this place. The sing. *צָר*, which occurs five times in Lamentations, is never in Jeremiah. He uses only the plural.—Ver. 6. *אָצָא מִן* for *forsaken* only here. *אֵלֵךְ* (masc.), *מִרְעָה* (Jeremiah always *מִרְעִית*) never with Jeremiah. *יִרְךָ* Jeremiah uses only with suffixes.—Ver. 7. *מִיֻּרִים* only here, iii. 19, and Is. lviii. 7. *מִחָכָר* (see vers. 10, 11; ii. 4) never in Jeremiah. He uses

* [Shall we doubt whether Shakspeare wrote Tarquin and Lucrece, and Venus and Adonis, because in all his plays there is nothing similar to the very artificial construction of these Spenserian poems? Can we expect the same style, the manifestations of precisely the same qualities of genius in a formal stately poem, like those mentioned, and in the free unembarrassed composition of the stage play? Shall we expect to find no new traits of genius and evidences of versatility of talent, when the orator-prophet, who has electrified Israel by his impromptu bursts of eloquence, called forth by passing events and pressing emergencies, sits down to the careful composition of a lyrical dirge, to be constructed in accordance with pre-determined artistic rules? It is possible that one might read Tarquin and Lucrece, and say that its author was incapable of writing Shakspeare's plays. Another might read the prophecies of Jeremiah and say, their author was incapable of producing the Lamentations. Both would be mistaken.—W. H. H.]

CHAPTER II. Ver. 1. *אָפּען* *âp. ley.* הָרוּם *hârom* (see i. 12; ii. 21, 22) never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 2. *בָּלַע* *Piel*, never in Jeremiah, in this chapter five times. Instead of *לֹא חָמַל* (see ver. 17) Jeremiah says *לֹא נָחַם* *only here*.—Ver. 3. Jeremiah uses only the Niphal of *נָדַר* *never in Jeremiah*. *חָשִׁיב אַחֲרָיו*, see i. 8. *יָמִין*, Jeremiah uses only once, and then not in a figurative sense. Jeremiah never says *כָּכִיב*, he uses in this connection always *אָחַל בַּת צִיּוֹן* or *כָּכִיבִים*—Ver. 4. *נִצַּב* *Niph.* never in Jeremiah. *מַחְדָּר*, see i. 7, 10, 11. *שָׁבַח* *only here*.—Ver. 5. *וּבָלַע*, see ver. 2. *הָאֲנִיָּה רֵאֲנָה* from Is. xxix. 2.—Ver. 6. *מוֹעֵד*, see i. 4. *Piel* only here. *שִׁפָּת* in Jeremiah only in the passage xvii. 21-27.—Ver. 7. *זָנַח* never in Jeremiah; in Lamentations three times, ii. 7; iii. 17, 31. *אֲרָנִי*, see i. 14. *נָצַר* in no form in Jeremiah. *הִכְבִּיר*, *Hiph.* never in Jeremiah, he once only uses the Pual (xiii. 19).—Ver. 8. *בָּלַע*, see ver. 2. Jeremiah does not use the *Hiph.* of *אָבַל חַל* never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 10. *עָפָר* never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 11. *דִּמְעוֹת* never in Jeremiah; he uses only *דִּמְעָה*, see i. 20. *בָּבֶר*, *never in Jeremiah*. *עֲשָׂה* (three times in Lamentations and only in ch. ii., namely, vers. 11, 12, 19) never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 12. *הִתְעַטֵּף*, see ver. 11. *הִשְׁתַּתַּפֵּן* never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 13. *דָּבָה* *Piel*, *שָׁוָה* and *בֵּית יְרוּשָׁלַם* (the last in Lamentations again ver. 15) never in Jeremiah. Jeremiah never constructs *רָכָא* with *ל*.—Ver. 14. Jeremiah never uses the verb *חָזָה* alone, nor *הָזָה שָׁוָה*. The latter is an expression occurring in Ezekiel. Also *חָמַל*, for which Jeremiah says *הִתְפַּדָּה* (xxiii. 13).—Jeremiah never uses *נָלָה* with *עַל* (see again iv. 22). *מִשְׁאוֹת* (chosen with reference to Jer. xxiii. 33-40) only here. Jeremiah uses *שָׁוָה* only in the formula *לְשׁוֹן מִדְּוָחִים* (probably framed with reference to Jer. xxvii. 10, 15) is *âp. ley.*—Ver. 15. Jeremiah never says *כָּפַק בָּפִים*, nor *עֲבָרִי דָרָךְ* (see i. 12), nor *הִנֵּיעַ רֹאשׁ*. For the last Jeremiah says *הִנִּיר בְּרֹאשׁ*, *בֵּית יְרוּשָׁלַם*, see ver. 13. The *ש*, *relat.*, never in Jeremiah; in Lamentations four times, ii. 15, 16; iv. 9; v. 18. *כָּלִילֵית יָפִי* is an expression of Ezekiel's (xxvii. 3; xxviii. 12). *כָּלִיל* is never found in Jeremiah.—Ver. 16. *פָּצָה* (see iii. 46), *הָקַר* never in Jeremiah. *בָּלַע*, see ver. 2.—Ver. 17. *בָּצַע* *Piel* never in Jeremiah. He uses only *בִּזְעָע בָּצַע* *אֲמָרָה*, *âp. ley.* *חָמַל*, see ver. 2. *קָרַן*, once in Jeremiah, *הָרִים קָרַן* never.—Ver. 18. *פִּנְיָה* (see iii. 49) only here. *בֵּית עֵיִן* only elsewhere in Ps. xvii. 8.—Ver. 19. *רֹאשׁ אֲשֶׁמְרוֹת*, *נֶשֶׂא בָפִים שֶׁפָּךְ לֵב*, *רֹאשׁ אֲשֶׁמְרוֹת* is found in Nah. iii. 10; Isa. li. 20; in the Lamentations again iv. 1; in Jeremiah never.—Ver. 20. *רָאָה רֵהֲבִיטָה*, see i. 11.

טַפְּחִים, *ἀπ. λεγόμεν.*—Ver. 21. יוֹם אֶף, see vers. 22, 1. לֹא חֲכִלָּה, see ver. 2.—Ver. 22. כּוֹעֵר, see i. 4. טַבַּח only here. רָפָה, Piel never in Jeremiah. יוֹם אֶף, see ver. 1.

CHAPTER III.—Ver. 1. עֵנִי (see i. 3) never in Jeremiah. שֵׁבֶט only found in Jeremiah in the critically suspicious places, x. 16; li. 19. שֵׁבֶט עֲבָרְתִּי, from Prov. xxii. 8.—Ver. 2. חֲשֹׁן נִהַג, never in Jeremiah. The sentence חֲשֹׁן וְלֹא אִוֵּר from Am. v. 18, 20; Job xii. 25.—Ver. 4. בָּלָה (see Isa. xxxviii. 13), never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 5. בָּקָה הִלָּאָה never in Jeremiah. רָאשׁ, *poison*, Jeremiah uses only in the phrase רָאשׁ מִי.—Ver. 6. כִּחְשָׁפִים never in Jeremiah. מִתֵּי עוֹלָם only elsewhere Ps. cxliii. 3; comp. Ps. lxxxviii. 5-7.—Ver. 7. נָדַר (see ver. 9), הִכְבִּיר Hiph., never in Jeremiah. וְלֹא אֵצֶא only elsewhere Ps. lxxxviii. 9. נִחַשְׁתָּ never in Jeremiah; he uses only נִחַשְׁתִּים.—Ver. 8. שָׁתַם (כָּתַם) שָׁתַם, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 9. נָדַר, see ver. 7. עָנָה גִּוִּית Piel, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 10. רַב never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 11. כּוֹרֵר as Pilel from כּוֹר, or Poel from כָּרַר, only here. פָּשַׁח is also *ἀπ. λεγ.* שׁוֹכֵם, see i. 4.—Ver. 12. כִּטְרָא, in the sense of *mark*, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 13. בָּנִי אֶשְׁכָּה only here.—Ver. 14. נִגְנָה never in Jeremiah, see ver. 63; v. 14.—Ver. 15. כְּרוּרִים never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 16. חָרָן never in Jeremiah. פָּפַשׁ *ἀπ. λεγ.*—Ver. 17. זָנַח never in Jeremiah, see ii. 7; Ps. lxxxviii. 15.—Ver. 18. נִצַּח, in the sense here required, and תּוֹחֵלֶת never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 19. עֵנִי, see i. 3. מְרוֹדִים, see i. 7. רָאשׁ, see ver. 5.—Ver. 20. שִׁיחַ never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 21. יָחַל, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 22. חֲכָרִים, plural, never in Jeremiah, see ver. 32.—Ver. 23. לִפְקָרִים never in Jeremiah; he uses in this sense, once only, לִפְקָר.—Ver. 24. אִמְרָה only here. יָחַל never in Jeremiah, see ver. 21.—Ver. 25. קָקָה. Kal never in Jeremiah; he uses only Piel and Niphal.—Ver. 26. יָחַל only here. רִיבָם never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 27. עֵפֶר, נָתַן פֶּה בְּעֵפֶר only here.—Ver. 28. נָטַל never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 29. לָחִי, (see i. 2), never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 30. כִּפָּה Part., (see i. 2), never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 31. זָנַח (see ver. 17; ii. 7), never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 32. יָנָה (see ver. 17; i. 4, 5, 12), never in Jeremiah. Plural (see ver. 22) never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 33. עָנָה, in this sense (see v. 11), as well as its derivative יָנָה, עָנִי (see ver. 32), בָּנִי אִישׁ, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 34. אֶסִּיר never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 35. עֲלִיזִין הִטּוֹת מְשֻׁבָּט פִּי, as a name of God (see ver. 38), never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 36. עָנִית (see ver. 59) never in Jeremiah. אֶרְנִי, see i. 14.—Ver. 37. אֶמְרֵי יִהְיֶה, from Ps. xxxiii. 9. אֶרְנִי, see i. 14.—Ver. 38. עֲלִיזִין, see ver. 35.—Ver. 39. חֲטָא אָנֹךְ (see i. 8) never in Jeremiah. Jeremiah uses חֵ only in oaths.—Ver. 40. חֲבַשׁ never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 41. נִשָּׂא (see ii. 19), never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 42. נִחְנִי never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 43. סָכַךְ (see ver. 44) never in Jeremiah. לֹא חֲמִלָּה, see ii. 2, 17, 21.—Ver. 44. סָכַךְ, see ver. 43.—Ver. 45. כָּחִר and מָאֹס, as substantives, only here; Jeremiah expresses these ideas otherwise. בָּקָרָב never in Jeremiah without suffix; he says בְּתוֹךְ.—Ver. 46. See ii. 16.—Ver. 47. הִשָּׂאת only here.—Ver. 48. פָּלַג never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 49. הִפְגִּיחַ *ἀπ. λεγ.* See ii. 18.—Ver. 50. שָׁקַף never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 51. עוֹלָלָה, see i. 12.—Ver. 52. צָפּוּר never in Jeremiah. חֲנִי only here.—Ver. 53. צָבַת never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 54. צִיר, צִיר never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 55. תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 56. רְחוּחַ עֵלֶם, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 57. יוֹם אֶקְרָאָךְ, Kal Jeremiah never uses: nor the expression יוֹם אֶקְרָאָךְ.—Ver. 58. The plural רִיבִים Jeremiah never uses. נָאֵל he uses once in the participle.—Ver. 59. עֲנִיתָ only here.—Ver. 60. הִנֵּין never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 61. קִימָה only here. נָבַט, see i. 11. כִּנְגִינָה, see ver. 14; the word is *ἀπ. λεγ.*—Ver. 62. הִשִּׁיב נְכוּל never in Jeremiah; he says שָׁלֵם נְכוּל יְהִיָּם. מְעֻשָׁה יְהִיָּם in Jeremiah only in the critically disputed passage xxv. 14.—Ver. 63. הִנָּחָה, both *ἀπ. λεγ.*—Ver. 64. שָׁמִי יִי שָׁמִי only here.

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. הָיָה, see i. 11.—Ver. 2. For נִהַפֵּךְ in this sense Jeremiah uses נָכַב, vi. 12.—Ver. 5. הִנֵּנִי, על צִיָּאָר, Pual only here. בָּרַךְ, in the sense of *driving, hunting*, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 7. כָּבַל never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 8. פָּרַק never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 9. חָרַב. חִמְדִּי only here.—Ver. 10. וְלִעֲפָה, תִּנְיֹר, בָּמֶר, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 11. עָנָה, see iii. 33.—Ver. 12. תִּלְהָה, הָרַר, never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 13. מָחוּךְ, ἀπ. λεγ.—Ver. 14. גִּנִּינָה, see iii. 14.—Ver. 17. רִנּוֹחַ, see i. 13.—Ver. 18. שׁ, *relat.*, see ii. 15. שְׁעָלִים, הִלֵּךְ Piel, never in Jeremiah, who always expresses these ideas in other words.—Ver. 19. לִדֹר יָדָר never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 20. אֶרֶךְ never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 21. חָרַשׁ never in Jeremiah.—Ver. 22. עַד-מָאָר never in Jeremiah.

I will lay no stress on the *ἀπαξ λεγόμενα*, which are included for the sake of completeness in the above catalogue. But besides these, there remains so great a number of words, expressions and constructions foreign to the usual language of Jeremiah, that I know not how the conclusion can be escaped, that Jeremiah could not have written the Lamentations. Or how may it be explained, that Jeremiah never uses *עֲלִיךְ*, never *אֵלֶיךָ* alone by itself, as a name of God, and yet that the latter occurs fourteen times in the Lamentations; that Jeremiah never uses *הָכִיתִי*, never *עָנָה* or its root *עָנָה*, never *שׁוּמִים*, never *אָנַח*, *אָנַח*, *אָנַח*, *חָטָא*, *בְּהִמָּר*, *בָּלַע*, *חָמַל*, *לֹא חָמַל*, *עָפָר*, *לֹא חָמַל*, *בָּלַע*, *בְּהִמָּר*, *חָטָא*, *אָנַח*, *אָנַח*, *אָנַח*, *שׁוּמִים*, never *נִשָּׂא פָנִים*, *יָחַל*, *נִגְיָה*, *חֲשֹׁן*, *פָּצָה*, *חִזָּה*, *לָמוּ*, never the *שׁ relat.*, never *בִּקְרָב* without a suffix, whilst all these expressions occur more or less frequently in the Lamentations? And, be it observed, these expressions are not of so specific a sort that their omission in the prophetic book, and their employment in the Lamentations, would be explicable from the nature of the subject treated of, but they belong for a great part, if I may say so, to the home-costume of the writer, which he always wears, of which he avails himself more or less unconsciously and undesignedly.

Thirdly. The words **וְנִבֵּיאוּךָ חֹזֵן לָךְ שְׁוֵא יְהוֹי**, ii. 14, are beyond doubt a quotation from Ezekiel xii. 24; xiii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 23; xxi. 28, 34; xxii. 28; for only in those places, and nowhere else in the Old Testament, does the phrase **חֹזֵן שְׁוֵא** in connection with **תָּפַל** occur. The phrase **כְּלִילֹת יָפִי**, ii. 15, is also decidedly Ezekiel's, for it is found only in Ezek. xxvii. 3; comp.

xxviii. 12, and nowhere else.* That the Lamentations may be the source from which Ezekiel obtained these phrases, no one can believe who has read Ezekiel in the places referred to with attention. For in those places (especially in chapter xiii.) everything is so peculiar and so impressed, in construction and expression,—as where he uses תִּפְּלָה, —with the distinct individuality of Ezekiel, that a borrowing of the words is not to be thought of. I say the words, for that Ezekiel had in mind the substance of Jer. xxiii., cannot be doubted. If then in Lam. ii. 14, 15, we have quotations from Ezekiel, what is the inference with reference to the authorship of our Book by Jeremiah? In the prophetic book, even in the latest parts of it, we find no trace of the adoption of Ezekiel's phraseology.† If we detect this here, it must be conceded that *Jeremiah* might have received already some parts of Ezekiel's Book before the whole was finished. Were the Jeremiatic origin of the Lamentations established in other respects, then perhaps we could allow this particular matter to pass without question. But since the differences in language strongly shake that traditional opinion, we are obliged to say that a quotation from Ezekiel in the Lamentations argues rather against the opinion that Jeremiah wrote the Lamentations, than for it. See further below, under 2d general head of this section.

We are therefore compelled to decide that the tradition which has the Septuagint for its first representative rests on no solid foundation, and is in opposition especially to the philological characteristics of the book. But who then did write the Lamentations? We can take it for granted that the author must have been an eye-witness of the incidents related in his book. For he speaks with such warmth of feeling, with such clear insight and accurate knowledge of the events he narrates, that it is evident that he does not speak of matters learned at a distance and through others, but of those of which he has a direct personal knowledge and experience. Especially the last two chapters, which have a more prosaic character exactly reflecting the things as they actually were, are copious in details which seem to us to be copied from life. In chapter fourth the author, alluding to the humiliating sufferings of the people, in order to heighten the effect, describes the Israelites generally as the nobility of the nations, and then especially singles out the nobility of Israel, and contrasts their former with their present condition. Since he thus extols the nobility of his people, with manifest predilection, yes, enthusiasm (see iv. 7, comp. i. 6, and remarks on those places), and since in this connection he says nothing at all of the culpability of those high in rank, which Jeremiah makes so eminently conspicuous (Jer. ii. 26; v. 5, 25-28; xxiii. 1, 2; xxxiv. 19; xxxvii.; xxxviii.; xlv. 17), but on the contrary, very decidedly blames the prophets and priests, as the causers of the misfortune (ii. 14; iv. 13-15), all this seems to indicate that our author belongs to the order of the שְׂרָרִים [the princes, or nobles].‡ In this opinion we are strengthened when we read the description

* [Dr. Naegelschach credits himself in the Preface with the important discovery that Lam. ii. 14 is a quotation from Ezekiel. The fact that this is a new discovery is suspicious. May he not have mistaken a mere coincidence in the use of language for a citation of one author from another? Our suspicion grows into certainty when we find that a quotation from Ezekiel in this passage involves the necessity of an absurd and impossible translation of the word תִּפְּלָה,—“Thy prophets saw for

thee falsehood and white-wash!” As regards the other words involved in these supposed quotations in ii. 14, 15, there is nothing so unique or remarkable in them, but that they might have occurred to any two different writers. But even if they were phrases of striking peculiarity, both writers might have borrowed them from the popular dialect of the day. The American people gave to English literature in our last war many words and phrases that have since appeared simultaneously in our best writers. So the Jewish people, fearfully awakened from the delusions into which their false prophets had betrayed them, may have cried out in their passion חֲזוֹן שָׁוָא, and lamented over their ruined city as כְּלִילֵת יָפִי and Ezekiel and Jeremiah, even on the assumption that the latter had not seen or heard the prophecies that were uttered in Chebar, may both have adopted the phrases that were passing from mouth to mouth. We ought not to forget, either, that both prophets were inspired by the same Spirit, and hence coincidences in thought and expression were to be expected. Our object in these remarks is simply to show, that the repetition in the Lamentations of words and phrases in Ezekiel, does not presuppose an acquaintance with Ezekiel's prophecies. But in point of fact Ezekiel's prophecies contained in chapters xii. xiii. xxi. xxii. were in all probability known to the Jews in Palestine almost as soon as published in Chaldaea. See notes on ii. 14, 15.—W. H. H.]

† [We do find great resemblances in phraseology between the two; and if every remarkable expression occurring in two authors, must be in one of them a quotation from the other, either Jeremiah quotes Ezekiel, or Ezekiel Jeremiah, very often. Observe, for instance, the peculiar use of גְּלוּלָה in the sense of *captivity*, and the use of symbolical names, especially פִּקְדוֹן. Jer. i. 21; Ezek. xxiii. 23.—W. H. H.]

‡ This is not complimentary to the author. The book itself furnishes evidence that its author could not be blinded by

iv. 17-20, where the author so vividly and intelligently describes, as only an eye-witness could, the king's flight and his capture. He must therefore have been one of the king's companions and belonged to his court. But he seems himself to have escaped capture. Else he had shared the fate of the other princes captured with the king, who according to Jer. lii. 10, were put to death together at Riblah. Since he was not captured, neither could he have been transported, but must have joined himself to the company of those remaining in the land who afterwards fled to Egypt. Hence v. 9, 10 relate to his personal experience.

2. As regards the *Time of Composition*, chapter second at least must have been written after the book of Ezekiel was known: for vers. 14, 15 of that chapter presuppose Ezekiel xii., xiii., xxi., xxii., xxvii., consequently the first part of his writings (i.-xxxii) at least. These verses could not have been added at a later period, for they were necessary to the completeness of the alphabet from the first. Still less could the whole of the second chapter have been composed at a later period, for the whole work, based from beginning to end on its five-fold construction, was in fact made out of one casting. But when the first copy of Ezekiel's writings may have reached Egypt, it is impossible to ascertain. We can only say this much, that the latest date mentioned in Ezekiel's writings is the 27th year of Jechoniah's captivity (Ezek. xxix. 17). This refers us to the year 571 or 570 B. C., and consequently to a period about which time, according to the greatest probability, Jeremiah's death occurred. For though we were obliged to show [in the Commentary on Jeremiah, lii. 31-34] that it was not absolutely impossible for Jeremiah to have lived till the year 561, B. C., yet this is only the extremest imaginable possibility. Much more likely is it that he lived only till about the year 570. See Intr. to Jeremiah, pp. ix., xii. But Ezekiel, even if he received his last revelation in the year 571-570, must after that have consumed some time in finishing the composition of his book, and more time still must have elapsed before a copy of his writings could come from Chebar to Egypt.* Besides, is it credible that Jeremiah, in his old age and while suffering every affliction, wrote a book so artistic in its construction, and so full of sprightliness, as the Book of Lamentations is? It can as little be inferred from iii. 4, that the author was old, as it can from iii. 27, that he was young. But the freshness and vivacity with which the book is written, and the labor which it has cost, make it improbable that it was written by an aged man in the last stage of his vital powers.

3. That the five songs are the work of one and the same author, is evident from the following facts and considerations: (1.) The unity of the plan, proved above. (2.) The thrice repeated initial word אִכָּה, in i. 1; ii. 1; iv. 1. For it would be indeed remarkable in the highest degree, if different writers had begun their songs with precisely the same word. (3.) The similarity of the language. Although verbal peculiarities occur, which distinguish the songs from each other, yet a common language prevails in all. In regard to the first point, the phrase מִנְחָם occurs four times (i. 2, 9, 17, 21) and רַחֵם מִנְחָם once (i. 6) in the first chapter, and in no other: נִנְחָה three times (i. 4, 8, 11) and substantive אֲנִיחָה once (i. 22), and in no other chapter; מַחֲמֵר (מַחְמֵר) three times in the first (vers. 7, 10, 11), once in the second chapter (ver. 4); כָּלֵעַ five times in the second chapter (vers. 2, 5 bis, 8, 16), and exclusively there; the same is true of עֲטָרָה, which occurs three times, although in different forms, in ch. ii. (vers. 11, 12, 19); and יוֹם אֶף occurs three times in ch. ii. (vers. 1, 21, 22), and only there. Each of the following words occurs twice in ch. iii., גִּדְרָה (vers. 7, 9), רֹאשׁ (vers. 5, 19), אוֹחִיל (vers. 21, 24, comp. vers.

the prejudices of rank, nor meanly capable of exempting his own rank from just censure. The internal evidence is in favor of the opinion that he was himself a prophet and a priest, and intimately associated with the nobility of the land, if not himself a noble.—W. H. H.]

* [It is here assumed that Ezekiel's prophecies were not published till all of them, or a large portion of them, had been carefully collated in book-form and that then they were formally circulated. The modern process of writing, printing, and publishing, seems to be in the writer's mind. In fact, probably, each prophecy, whether first spoken or written, was instantly and rapidly communicated to all the Jews. It would travel, with marching armies and numerous caravans, to Palestine, and thence by various channels to Egypt, not only in written form, but repeated orally and accurately by those, who in that age of few books and fewer readers, were able readily and exactly to memorize all that their prophets and poets composed. It may be proper here again to refer to the fact that Ezek. i.-xxiii. was certainly complete before the destruction of Jerusalem, and may have been finished a year, or longer, before that event.—W. H. H.]

18, 26), חָכְרִים (vers. 22, 32) כָּכָךְ (vers. 43, 44), עֲנִיתָ and עֲנִתָה (vers. 36, 59). In ch. iv. לָמוֹ occurs twice (vers. 10, 15). In ch. v. no similar repetition of characteristic expressions occurs. I believe that these more frequent repetitions in the first chapters are due to the more lavish expenditure of art, for which those chapters are remarkable. Not that these repetitions are themselves indications of art; they are rather the involuntary consequence of that constraint which an artificial style imposes upon the writer. As the Poet becomes better accustomed to the artificial form in ch. iii., these repetitions decrease in number.* To the same cause we must ascribe the peculiarity that the Divine name יְהוָה occurs only in the first three chapters. Up to the culmination point, which we recognize in the middle of ch. iii. (vers. 19-40), we find this Divine name, which belongs rather to grave and solemn discourse, thirteen times, and afterwards in the *decrecendo* passage it occurs only once (iii. 58).† Apart from these repetitions in one and the same chapter, which prove nothing against the identity of the author, many characteristic expressions are repeated in several chapters, a fact which testifies that one and the same style, or habit of speaking, prevails throughout the whole Book. The following expressions thus occur. נָהָה, i. 4, 5, 12, and iii. 32, 33. עָנִי, i. 3, 7, 9, and iii. 1, 19. עֲנִיָּה, *deprimere*, iii. 33, and v. 11. וָנָח, ii. 7, and iii. 17, 31. נִגְיָה, iii. 14, 63, and v. 14. לֹא חָמַל, ii. 2, 17, 21, and iii. 43. רֹאשׁ-כְּלִי-חַיּוֹת, ii. 19, and iv. 1. טוֹב (*happy*), iii. 26, and iv. 9. צָר (*sing.*), i. 5, 7, 10, and iv. 12. הִפְסֵט, i. 11, 12; iii. 63; iv. 16; and v. 1. גָּלָה עַל, ii. 14, and iv. 22. דָּוָה, i. 13, and v. 17. שֵׁשׁ, *relat.*, ii. 15, 16; iv. 9; and v. 18. כּוֹעֵר (*place or time of a festivity*), i. 4, 15, and ii. 6, 7, 22. שׁוֹמֵם, i. 4, 13, 16, and iii. 11. מְרִירִים, i. 7, and iii. 19. חֲטָא, i. 8, and iii. 39. עֲבָרִי בְּרֹךְ, i. 12, and ii. 15. עוֹלָל (*עוֹלֵל*), i. 12, 22; ii. 20, and iii. 51. חֲמִירָם, i. 20, and ii. 11. שִׁב אַחֲוֹר, i. 8, and ii. 3. מִחֲכֹר (*מִחֲכֹר*), i. 7, 10, 11, and ii. 4. פָּצָה, ii. 16, and iii. 46. הִפְנוֹתָ, ii. 18, and iii. 49. לָחִי, i. 2, and iii. 30. גָּפֶר, ii. 10, and iii. 29. נִשָּׂא לֵבָב, ii. 19, and iii. 41. I think that this comparison, which contains only those instances that are most apparent to the eye, strengthens the principal argument for the identity of the author of the several songs, which argument consists in the unity of the plan on which they are constructed.

§ 4. LITERATURE.

We have the Patristical Commentaries of THEODORET and EPHRAEM SYRUS.—JEROME has not explained this Book. The short *Tractatus in Jeremie Lamentationes*, which is found under his name in the editions of his works, and which is nothing but a mystical interpretation of the alphabet, was composed, according to GHISLER., SIXTUS SENENSIS and BELLARMINE (see GHISLER., p. 5), by RHABANUS MAURUS, according to BALLARSIIUS and others (see VALLARS. Tom. V. p. 1011), by the venerable BEDE.—The book of Lamentations was held in high esteem

* [We must wholly dissent from any such explanation of these repetitions. To do so, were to transform some of the most beautiful and impressive passages in these poems into blemishes, that betray the carelessness or the want of skill of the sacred writer. There are few instances in which the reasons for the repetition are not apparent: none in which we cannot imagine that they were intended for rhetorical or poetical effect. The constantly recurring theme in the first song, *there is no comforter, or she has no comforter*, is one of the master strokes of a great poet. This emphasizes again and again the theme of the whole poem. This is the very acme of the distress of the daughter of Jerusalem, who having forsaken her God, now *sitteth solitary*, herself forsaken both of God and men, *she hath no comforter*! So in the second song, *the day of His wrath*, and the frequent recurrence of the words *anger* and *wrath* serve to keep in view the one great thought of this particular song, that God Himself had appeared as an *enemy* and an avenger. Not only was Jerusalem as a forsaken woman without a comforter, God had turned against her. He had destroyed His own Zion where He dwelt among His people, and all that they suffered, they suffered at His hand, and we are not for a moment allowed to forget that we are reading of what God does in the day of His wrath. The repetitions in the first chapter of that tremulous word נִנָּחֵם, till we seem to hear

the broken sighs of priests and people, yea, and of the forsaken sufferer herself; and in the second chapter, of the short expressive word בָּלַע, till we understand that nothing has escaped the desolations of Heaven's wrath, that everything is literally and utterly *swallowed up or consumed*, are instances of that masterly art by which a great poet impresses an idea on the mind by a single word, repeated again and again, with increasing emphasis, where a writer of inferior ability would weaken the force by dividing it among many words. But without multiplying instances, it may be well here to make a general observation which will apply to all these repetitions, and that is that the language of violent passion, and especially of grief, is always broken up into short words, and indulges in the frequent repetition of them.—W. H. H.]

† [See note on this word on p. 32.]

by the Fathers. GREGORY NAZIANZEN says of it (in his *Orat. prima de pace*, according to GHISLER, p. 4), "As often as I take this book into my hands, and am engaged in reading those Lamentations (whenever I do read it, I desire to be modest in the enjoyment of prosperity), my voice choked with emotion is lost, my eyes are filled with tears, and I seem to see the very calamity he describes and lament with him in his lamentations." The alphabetical acrostic furnished rich material for allegorical interpretation. Thus CASSIODORUS (explic. Ps. xxiv., in GHISLER, p. 3), says, "Jeremiah bemoaned the captivity of Jerusalem in a quadruple alphabetical Lamentation, indicating to us, by the sacrament of letters, the mysteries of celestial things."—With respect to Rabbinical Commentators, we refer to those mentioned on the Prophet Jeremiah, to whom we must add ABEN EZRA.—There is a Hebrew Commentary by M. MENDELSON, on the five Megilloth, with the title *אשכנזי ובאר חמש מגלות עם תרגום*, Wien, 1807.

Of later Christian Commentators we shall in general speak of such only as treat of this book alone. PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, *expositio in Lamentt. Jeremiæ*, Colon., 1532, and other editions.—[BULLINGER, Tigur., 1575.]—PETRUS FIGUEIRO, *Comment. in Lamentt. Jer. et in Malachiam proph.*, Leyden, 1596.—[CALVIN, *Prolog. in Threnos.*—OECOLAMPADIUS, Argent. 1558. ZUINGLIUS, 1544: are mentioned in *Intr. Jer.*—To this list MALDONATUS should be added.]—MARTINI DEL-RIO (a Jesuit), *Comment. literalis in Threnos*, Leyd., 1608.—JO. A. JESU MARIA, *Lamentationum Jer. interpretatio*, Neapel, 1608. LUC. BACMEISTER, *explicatio Threnorum*, Rost., 1603.—*Thren. Jer. latine vers. notisque expl.* a J. H. FATTENBORG, 1615 (*diss. academ.*).—[PETER MARTYR, Tigur., 1629.]—TARNOV, *Comment. in Thren.*, Rostock, 1642, Hamb., 1707.—[C. B. MICHAELIS, Notes in the *Uberiores Adnot. in Hagiogr. U. T. Libros*, by J. H. MICHAELIS and others, Vol. II., 1730.]—JOH. THEOPH. LESSING, *observationes in Tristitia Jerem.*, Lips., 1770.—*Jeremia's Klagegesänge, übersetzt und mit Annm.* von J. G. BÖRMEL, mit einer Vorrede begleitet von HERDER, Weimar, 1781.—J. F. SCHLEUSSNER, *curæ crit. et exeget. in Threnos Jeremiæ* (in EICHHORN's *Repert. für bibl. und morgenl. Literatur.*, P. xii., Leipzig, 1783).—G. A. HORRER, *neue Bearbeitung der Klagegesänge*, Halle, 1784.—*Jeremia's Klagegesänge, übers. und mit. Annm.* von JOEL LEWIE u. AARON WOLFSOHN, Berlin, 1790.—PAREAU, JOH. HEINE, *Threni Jer. philolog. et crit. illustr.*, Leyden, 1790.—[J. HAMON, *Comm. sur les Lam. de Jérémie*, Paris, 1790.—J. D. MICHAELIS, *Obss. philol. et crit. in Jerem. Vaticinia et Threnos, Edidit et auxit* J. F. SCHLEUSNER, Gotting., 1793 (see *Intr. Jer.*).—J. K. VOLBORTH, *Klagegesänge aufs neue übers.*, Celle, 1795.]—JOH. OTTO, *dissert. philolog. critica ad Thren. Jer.* (præsidi C. F. SCHNURER), Tübing., 1795.—J. F. GAAB, *Beiträge zur Erkl. des sog. H. Lieds, Kohelets und der Klagelieder*, Tüb., 1795.—J. MELCH. HARTMANN, *die Klagel. d. Jer. übers. (in den Blumen althebr. Dichtkunst v. JUSTI)*, Giessen, 1809.—[T. A. DERESER, *Die Klagelieder u. Baruch, aus d. Hebr. u. Griech. übers. u. erklärt*, Frankf. a. M., 1809.]—*Die Elegien des Jerem. in griech. Versmass getreu übers.* (von WELCKER), Giessen, 1810.—*Threnos Jer. metricè reddidit notisque illustr.*, C. A. BJÖRN, Havniæ, 1814.—G. RIEGLER, *die Klagl. des. Proph. Jer. aus dem Hebr. in's Deutsche übers. mit Annm.*, Erlangen, 1814.—FRANC. ERDMANN, *curarum exegetico-criticarum in Jer. Thren. specimen*, Rostock, 1818.—C. P. CONZ, *die Klagl. d. Jer.* (in BENGEL's *Archiv.*, Bd. IV. S. 146 ff.), Tub., 1821.—THEOD. FRITZ, *novi in Thr. Jer. Commentarii specimen, exegesis Cap. i. exhibens. Dissert. theol.*, Argent., 1825.—[E. F. C. ROSENMUELLER, Lat. trans. and notes in his *Scholæ in V. T. pars* 8., Vol. ii., 1827. See *Intr. Jer.*]—SPORSEN, *Threni, etc., suethice cum adnot. philolog.*, Lund., 1823.—GOLDWITZER, *Uebersetz. mit Vergl. der Sept. und Vulg. und krit. Annm.*, 1828.—[MAURER, notes in his *Comm. gram. crit. in V. T.*, 1835, 691-708. See *Intr. Jer.*]—C. A. H. KALKAR, *Lamentt. crit. et exeg. illustr.*, Hafniæ, 1836.—WIEDENFELD, *Uebers.*, Elberfeld, 1838.—TANCHUMI HIEROS., *commentarius arabicus in Lamentt. e cordice unico*, Bodleiano ed. Cureton, London, 1843.—[A. HETZEL, *Die Klagelieder in deutsche Liederform übertragen mit erkl. anm.*, 1854.]—THENIUS, *im kurzges. exeg.*, Hdb., 1855. VAHLINGER, 1857.—[NEUMANN, *Jeremias u. Klagelieder*, 1858.]—*Die Thränenlieder des Proph. Jerem. Eine bibl. Studie* von H. BECKH. In der *Zeitschr. f. Prot. u. K.* März, 1861. See the "*Lebensbild des Proph. Jeremia*," attributed to the same author, in the *Deutschen Zeitschr. f. Christl. Wiss. etc.*, 1859, Nr. 19-21.—F. EWALD in den *Dichtern des A. B. Theil. i., zweite Hälfte*, S. 321 ff., 1866.—*Die Klagel. Jer. übers. u. ausgel.* v. WILH. ENGELHARDT. Leipzig, Teubner, 1867.—[*Die Klagelieder Jeremiä*

erklärt von Dr. ERNEST GERLACH, Berlin, 1868. A very valuable commentary, published about the same time with this volume of LANGE.—“Other translations which deserve mention here, but which embrace either the poetical books or the whole of the Old Testament, are those of DATHE, DEWETTE, CAHEN, MEIER, and H. A. PERRET-GENTIL (*La Sainte Bible*, Paris, 1866, publ. by the Société biblique protestante de Paris).” SMITH’S *Dict. Bible*, Am. ed., art. “*Lamentations*,” note by “A.”—W. H. H.]

[English Translations and Commentaries. WILLIAM LOWTH, *Commentary upon the Prophecies and Lamentations of Jeremiah*, London, 1718, and BENJAMIN BLAYNEY, *Jeremiah and Lamentations. A new translation with notes critical, philological and explanatory*, Oxford, 1784, are referred to by Dr. NÆGELSACH, in the *Introduction to Jeremiah’s Prophecies*.—“*Jeremy the Prophet, with the Song of Moses, translated by GEORGE JOYE in the month of May. 8vo. 1534*.”—“*The Wailings (i. e. the Lamentations) of the Prophet Hierimiah, done into English verse by GEO. DRANT, Lond., Thomas Marshe, 1566* :—*The Lamentations of Jeremy with notes, by HUGH BROUGHTON*, no place, nor printer’s name, 4to, 1608.” are mentioned in CLARKE’S “*Concise view of the succession of sacred Literature*.” The last is preserved in “*The works of the Great Albionean Divine, renowned in many nations for rare skill in Salem’s and Athens’ Tongues, and familiar acquaintance with all Rabbinical Learning*, Mr. HUGH BROUGHTON; collected into one volume, and digested into four Tomes. London, printed for Nath. Ekins, 1662.” The Preface, containing life of H. BROUGHTON, is signed JOHN LIGHTFOOT. The translation is one of the first into English directly from the Hebrew, and is characterized by great simplicity and force, and an agreeable musical rhythm. The notes are curious, but of little exegetical value, and abruptly terminate with the sixth verse of the second chapter, as if the author tired of them, for he closes with this singular remark: “And further large commenting I shall not need. The learned in Ebrew upon a warning may by mine examples search how still from other holy writers Jeremy fetches his phrases.”—The very valuable *Annotations of Westminster Assembly*, contributed by JOHN GATAKER, about 1642.—Nearly the whole Book of Lamentations is “metrically analyzed and translated” in a work showing considerable knowledge of Hebrew and a very weak judgment, called *Hebrew Criticism and Poetry*, by GEORGE SOMERS CLARKE, D.D., London, 1810.—“The Calvin Translation Society,” in Vol. V. of CALVIN’S *Commentaries*, Edinburgh, 1855, have given us, besides the valuable *Commentary on the Lamentations*, a metrical version in English of CALVIN’S *Latin Version*; the translator and editor, Rev. JOHN OWEN, Vicar of Thrussington, and rural Dean, Leicestershire, has added many notes of his own, and sometimes gives us a new translation from the Hebrew. The quotations from CALVIN’S *Commentary* in the following pages, made by the present translator, are all taken from OWEN’S translation, without reference to the original.—“*The Holy Bible . . . now translated from corrected texts of the original Tongue, and with former translations diligently compared, . . . by B. BOOTHROYD, D.D.*” London, 1853. BOOTHROYD in the translation of the Lamentations has copied too closely the translation of BLAYNEY, which with all its excellencies, is often fanciful and sometimes rests on merely conjectural changes of the received text: BOOTHROYD affords little exegetical help in his brief notes, many of which are unmarked quotations from BLAYNEY.—Deservedly better known is the translation from the original Hebrew and Commentary, by E. HENDERSON, D.D. London, 1851.—The “American Unitarian Association,” has furnished us with a new translation of Lamentations, with notes, by GEORGE R. NOYES, D.D., Vol. 2d of the *Hebrew Prophets*. 3d edition. Boston, 1866. The notes are good, but meagre and insufficient. The translation generally is marked by taste and good judgment, but sometimes indicates haste and absence of careful study.—The notes of CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln, in Vol. V., Part II., of his “*Holy Bible, in the authorized version, with notes and introductions*,” London, 1869, make us wish that they were more numerous and more extended.—W. H. H.]

Of Homiletical Treatises, should be mentioned the *Conciones in Thren. Jer.*, by the Franciscan JOH. WILD (*Ferus*), Colon., 1570; but especially, the admirable and frequently found *Seventeen Sermons*, which were delivered by EGID. HUNNIUS, at that time Professor in Marburg, in the year 1585, at Frankenberg in Hesse, to which place the University was removed from time to time on account of the plague, and which were afterwards published under the

title of "*Die Klagelieder des h. Proph. Jer. ausgelegt u. erkl. zu Frankenberg, in 17 Predigten,*" etc. First ed., 1588. I have the third edition: Frankfurt a. M., 1600.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS ON THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP.

BY W. H. H.

The commonly received opinion that Jeremiah was the author of the Lamentations is sustained by the following considerations:

1. The presumptive probability that Jeremiah was the author is strong. Dr. NAEGELSBACH concedes its force (see p. 9).

Jeremiah survived the fall of the city long enough to have written this book. The authentic records of his history close with his residence among the Jewish fugitives in Tahpanhes, Egypt (Jer. xliii. 8). Whether we accept the early Christian tradition that "the Jews at Tahpanhes, irritated by his rebukes, at last stoned him to death" (SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.*), or the report that he was "put to death by king Hophra" (MILMAN'S *Hist. of the Jews*); or adopt the more likely belief of the Jews, "that on the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, he with Baruch made his escape to Babylon or Judea and died in peace," having lived to add the last words appended to his prophecies, Jer. lii. 31-34 (see SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.*, art. "Jeremiah," STANLEY'S *Jewish Church*, Series 2d, p. 620),—it is at least certain, that Jeremiah survived the destruction of Jerusalem long enough to have written the Lamentations, which include historical facts not complete till after the death of Gedaliah and the flight to Egypt. Surviving, it is next to incredible, that he, the prophet of the destruction, should not be the author of this poem of lamentation over the great event and issue of his prophetic career. Who can read first his prophetic book and then this description of the city and the people after the destruction of the former, and not say,—if Jeremiah still lived, Jeremiah and no other was the painter of this picture, in which all the conspicuous figures are what his former writings would lead us to expect, which presents an exact fulfilment of all he predicted, and which so corresponds with the doctrine, facts and provisions, contained in the prophetic book, that when we turn from one to the other, it is difficult to say which picture is most like the reality,—which is the mirror that most accurately reflects the downfall of the State and the dispersion of the people! "The poems belong unmistakably to the last days of the kingdom, or the commencement of the exile. They are written by one who speaks, with the vividness and intensity of an eye-witness, of the misery which he bewails. It might almost be enough to ask, who else then living could have written with that union of strong passionate feeling and entire submission to Jehovah, which characterizes both the Lamentations and the Prophecy of Jeremiah?" (SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.* art. *Lament.*). Who can believe that Jeremiah, after continuing to speak and write for God through a long life-time, so suddenly dropped the pen and remained silent and suffered a total eclipse from the splendor of an unknown author, to whose identity neither Scripture nor tradition give us the slightest clue?

2. The presumption that Jeremiah wrote the Lamentations is confirmed by the most decisive testimony of tradition.

Few historic facts are sustained by a tradition so ancient, so long undisputed and so generally received. The truthfulness of this tradition was never, we may say, seriously questioned till the middle of this century, when EWALD gave his verdict against it. Up to that time, with the exception of an anonymous writer in 1819, and the whimsical VON DER HAARDT in 1712, it was universally accepted by Jews and Christians. We trace it back through the Vulgate, the Syriac and the Septuagint versions, to the probable evidence of Hebrew MSS. earlier than the oldest of those versions (see note p. 8). The existence of such Hebrew MSS. is entirely probable. It is easier to account for the loss of what once were the connecting words between the Prophecies of Jeremiah and the Lamentations, by the transfer of the latter to the Hagiographa, than it is to explain the insertion of the words in the Septuagint and their reproduction, with additions and changes, in the Vulgate, if they never existed in Hebrew originals. It is impossible to suppose that the Septuagint translators inserted in the text a mere presumption of their own, "derived from the book itself," as Dr. NAEGELSBACH suggests. If it could be proved that

they did not find these words in Hebrew MSS., we must believe that they received them through written or oral tradition, that had descended to them from earlier ages and was, in their times, universally accepted and undisputed. It is not credible that such a tradition could have been founded in error. When and how could an error, in reference to the authorship of this book, have come into universal acceptance previous to the translation by the Seventy? It is asserted that other writings, of unknown authorship, were attributed by the Jews to Jeremiah (SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.*; STANLEY'S *Jewish Ch.*). But there is no evidence of their having attributed to him a canonical book, that had always been esteemed canonical, and had never been lost sight of or forgotten. There is reason to believe that this book was highly valued by the exiled Jews, and was in their possession on their return from captivity (SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.*, *art. Lam.*). From that time to the time of the translation of the LXX., the Jews, cured of idolatry, cherished their sacred Scriptures and especially revered the memory and the words of the prophet Jeremiah. During this long period, we can fix upon no point of time, when the true history of this extraordinary book could have been lost, when the brilliant name of its real author could have lapsed into oblivion, or when the fable could have been fabricated, that was destined to be universally accepted as a historic truth, that Jeremiah was that author.

3. The facts related or referred to in the book render it certain that Jeremiah wrote the book.

We have already ascertained that he lived long enough after the events alluded to had happened, to have written about them. We have also intimated that the topics discussed or suggested in the Lamentations are exactly what we would expect to find in a writing of Jeremiah's, composed after the destruction of Jerusalem. To this we now add, that the assumption that the Lamentations were written by one, who had been both a spectator of the events described and a participator in those events, points directly to Jeremiah as the probable author of the book. This assumption, indeed, is not inevitable; for not all graphic descriptions of events are written by those who participated in them: what eye-witness, for example, could bring the reader more immediately into the presence of actors and scenes far remote from the writer, than DEAN STANLEY, who has given us his eloquent version of the same incidents in Jewish history? But granting the assumption in the present instance, who could have been a more authentic writer of the facts contained in the Book of Lamentations, than the prophet Jeremiah? Or what great event is described in that Book, that was not witnessed and participated in by the prophet Jeremiah? Dr. NAEGELSBACH suggests only one possible exception; he would infer, from the description of the flight from Jerusalem and the pursuit and capture of the king and the princes, that the author of Lamentations was a companion of the king and one of the princes of the court. To this we answer; 1st. There is no intimation that even *one* of those princes escaped the slaughter at Riblah: "and the king of Babylon slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes: he slew also *all* the princes of Judah in Riblah." 2d. There is absolutely nothing, in the brief allusion in the Lamentations to the flight and capture of the king, that indicates that it was written by a companion of the king. The only possible reference to this tragical incident is contained in two verses, iv. 19, 20.* The 19th verse,—"*Our persecutors are swifter than the eagles of the heaven; they pursued us upon the mountains, they laid wait for us in the wilderness,*"—is in no sense personal to the writer, nor is its application to be restricted to the king and his army; but is spoken with reference to the whole people, as the preceding verses show, and refers to the rapid pursuit of all fugitives from the city, whether they endeavored, like the king, to find safety in the mountains of Jericho or the wilderness of Judea, or in any other mountains or wildernesses in the vicinity of the doomed city. The first member of ver. 20,—"*the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the LORD, was taken in their pits,*"—simply states the fact of the king's capture, without any incidental detail, such as would indicate a description of the event by an eye-witness; and the second member of this verse,—"*of whom we said, Under his shadow we shall live among the heathen,*"—is the language of the people generally, not of the companions of the king only, for the desire of the nation doubtless was, that their king should escape to some place of security, even among the heathen, whither they might follow him, and where they

* See notes on iv. 17-20, and note at end of ch. iv.

might gather around him and perpetuate their monarchy and nationality. There is, then, nothing in these two verses to embarrass the conclusion that Jeremiah wrote the Lamentations.

Having shown that there is nothing in this Book involving the personal experience and observation of the author, that renders it impossible for Jeremiah to have been that author, we come now to the fact, that there is much in this Book which belongs peculiarly and exclusively to the personal history of that prophet. This is especially true of the third chapter or song. Here we clearly have the prophet Jeremiah speaking to us. Dr. NAEGELSBACH himself is compelled to acknowledge this. But he says that the writer of the Book personifies the prophet and puts these words into his mouth. Who can believe this? Who could justify the sudden intrusion of a new speaker into such a finished composition, without a hint, either preceding or following his soliloquy, as to his name, rank, or official position? Who would imagine that any intelligent author would attempt such an abrupt assumption of another man's personality? Who can believe in the possibility of such a complete identification between an author and a character dramatically introduced into his poem? Either Jeremiah wrote the whole poem, or he wrote no part of it. If he wrote the whole, the 3d chapter, beginning with the words "*I am the man that hath seen affliction*," is natural, lucid and appropriate. If Jeremiah did not write the poem, this third chapter is certainly intended to deceive us into the belief that he did. Otherwise, it is an anomaly and solecism in literature, that no reputable writer could be guilty of. The argument that a modest man would not make himself the central object in his own poem, is of no force; especially when we remember that the poet is also the prophet of Jehovah, and not only on that account a representative man, but a living prophecy in his own life, as Hosea was. Besides, the argument may be offset by another consideration, that a poet, as skilful as the author of Lamentations was, would not leave us to guess who the central figure of his poem is, by the mere accidental coincidences of historical details. Indeed, we find in this absence of his name and titles the best evidence, that the modest Jeremiah was himself the author; for if another had written the Book, he would have had every inducement to tell us, that the great and holy prophet Jeremiah was the speaker in this 3d Song. The whole argument for modesty, however, is greatly overstrained, and receives no support from the free and frank way in which Jeremiah speaks of himself in his prophecies.

4. Characteristics and similarities of style add still further evidences to the fact that Jeremiah wrote the Lamentations.

Arguments derived from style are precarious. The investigations into the authorship of Junius admonish us that the most astute critics may be deceived, and that it is possible for an author to excel himself in one single production beyond the recognition of his most intimate and sagacious friends. In the present instance, we encounter the difficulty of determining what are the general characteristics of Jeremiah's style. Till the critics decide this point, the question whether the Lamentations harmonize with his style must be demurred. "JEROME complained of a certain rusticity in Jeremiah's style," an idea that NAEGELSBACH seems to accept (See p. 12. *Sermo incultus et pene subrusticus*.)* LOWTH confesses that he can discover no vestige of this rusticity, he thinks that in several of his prophecies he "approaches very near the sublimity of Isaiah," he regards Ezekiel as "much inferior to Jeremiah in elegance" (*Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, GREGORY's translation, II., pp. 88, 89). LOWTH also compares him to Simonides; and SEB. SCHMIDT compares him to Cicero (SMITH, *Bib. Dic., Art., Jeremiah*). Bishop WORDSWORTH, speaking of him as "peculiarly the prophet of the affections," calls him "the Euripides—and more than the Euripides—of the Hebrew canon" (Introduction to Jeremiah, p. xv.).—There is again a conflict of opinion in regard to the merits of the Lamentations as a work of art and taste. EWALD speaks of it slightly as possessing *some merit*. NOYES almost reproduces EWALD's language, when he says, "The Lamentations are, indeed, possessed of considerable merit in their way, but still betray an unpoetic period and degenerated taste" (*Introduction to Psalms*, p. 48). On the other hand, NAEGELSBACH accords the highest place to

* This opinion of JEROME might have been caused by the use of Aramaic forms and other peculiarities of later Hebrew. EICHORN, *Einführung*, III., p. 122. GESENIUS, *Geschichte der Heb. Sprache*, p. 35. Referred to in KITTO's *Cyc. Sac. Lit., art. Jeremiah*.

the Book as a work of art, and regards its production as far above and beyond the ability of the *uncultured and almost rustic* Jeremiah. He is certainly right in his appreciation of the style of the Lamentations, and many of the best judges of style agree with him. "Never was there a more rich and elegant variety of beautiful images and adjuncts, arranged together within so small a compass, nor more happily chosen and applied" (LOWTH, *De Sac. Poes. Heb. Prælect. XXII. KIRTO, Cyc. Bib. Lit.*). "Never did city suffer a more miserable fate, never was ruined city lamented in language so exquisitely pathetic. Jerusalem is, as it were personified, and bewailed with the passionate sorrow of private and domestic attachment: while the more general pictures of the famine, the common misery of every rank, and age, and sex, all the desolation, the carnage, the violation, the dragging away into captivity, the remembrance of former glories, of the gorgeous ceremonies, and the glad festivals, the awful sense of the Divine wrath heightening the present calamities, are successively drawn with all the life and reality of an eye-witness. They combine the truth of history with the deepest pathos of poetry" (MILMAN, *Hist. of Jews*, vol. I. B. viii. p. 260). Before we leave this matter of the general characteristics of the style of Jeremiah's prophecies and of the style of the Lamentations, we would repeat an assertion already made, that there must be, in the nature of the case, great diversity between "the oratorical prose" (as Bishop WORDSWORTH calls it) of the one* and the rhythmical lyrical poetry of the other.

The *acrostic structure* of the Lamentations is regarded as a peculiarity of style that Jeremiah would not have adopted. "DE WETTE maintains (*Comment. über die Psalm.*, p. 56) that this acrostic form of writing was the outgrowth of a feeble and degenerate age, dwelling on the outer structure of poetry when the soul had departed. His judgment as to the origin and character of the alphabetic form is shared by EWALD (*Poet. Büch.*, I., p. 140). It is hard, however, to reconcile this estimate with the impression made on us by such Psalms as the 25th and 34th; and EWALD himself, in his translation of the Alphabetic Psalms and the Lamentations, has shown how compatible such a structure is with the highest energy and beauty" (SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.*, art. *Lament.*, n. g.). The modern acrostic—the spelling out of words or sentences in the initial letters of rhymed verses—is justly regarded as a species of literary trifling, pleasing only to a fanciful, finical or puerile taste. If the alphabetical acrostic of the Hebrews is also to be regarded as belonging merely to the curiosities of literature, the chief or whole merit of the production consisting in the acrostic itself, or derived from the difficulties to be overcome, an exhibition of literary acrobaticism—poetry on an alphabetical tight-rope,—then we may condemn it as an evidence of vitiated taste, and should regard it as beneath the dignity of *any* inspired writer, and especially of such a glorious and venerable prophet as Jeremiah was. But we find on examination, that these alphabetical Hebrew poems have great merit, aside from their acrostic form, which they retain when stripped of that form, as they are in our modern translations. This and the fact that this form was ever adopted by inspired writers, lead us to the conclusion that the Hebrew alphabetical acrostic must have served a far higher purpose than our modern acrostics do. It is not impossible that it may have belonged to the highest art of ancient Hebrew poetry, though we, now, may not be able to appreciate all the excellencies an ancient Hebrew might have discerned in this species of writing.†

* "There remains a single class of poets among the Jews—a class peculiar to that people—the prophets. The most of them delivered their predictions in poetry. It is *sui generis*. It is not precisely poetry, nor is it oratory. It is sublime vision. The event seen passing before the mental eye of the prophet is revealed in lofty rhythm, in glowing imagery. It is eloquent in the highest sense, and stands near the line where oratory and poetry meet. It will be observed that the most impassioned strains of the greatest orators become rhythmical, and have a solemn march which resembles vision. We see it in all their greatest efforts" (*Pres. Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1861, Art. IV., *Hebrew Lang. and Poetry*, p. 463).

† GERLACH: "That the alphabetical arrangement may be regarded as inappropriate to Jeremiah, when his soul was filled with sorrow, can only be maintained by regarding the metrical style of poetry as generally inconsistent with deep grief, which no one presumes to do. Here the argument finally depends on the question as to the *signification of this alphabetical arrangement*. DE WETTE (*Comm. Psalms*, p. 58), declares it 'a rhythmical artifice, a product of the later and degenerated taste' (E. REUSS in HERZOG'S *Encyc.* V., p. 906. *Speierlet*), and EWALD (*Poet. Büch.* I., S. 139. 3 Aufl. I., S. 201) esteems it a sign of 'declining art,' against what SOMMER (*bibl. Abhandl.* S. 94) says for the higher age of this form of poetry (as HITZIG also, at least he does not deny the Davidical authorship of Ps. ix. and x. on account of the alphabetical structure). But if it were proved that such an artificial construction were, on general grounds, unworthy of the prophet, then 'with equal propriety we would condemn the Songs, *Befehl du deine Wege*, by P. GERHARDT, and *Wie schön leucht uns der Morgenstern*, by NICOLAI, since there is an artificialness in the beginning of the verses, such as we could not expect in poets so pre-eminent and vigorous' (HENGSTENBERG, *P's.* 2, S. 93); and even TRENIUS allows (S. 190) that this were hypercritical. So

Without doubt it had mnemonic advantages and also served the purpose of an artificial vinculum for thoughts and sentences having no close logical connection. But we cannot accept the opinion that these were its only or even its chief recommendations.* Jeremiah might have been influenced by the first reason in adopting this style in the Lamentations: but the other could hardly have influenced him, for the Lamentations are not composed of thoughts and sentences loosely connected, as has been too often asserted, needing to be strung together by this alphabetical artifice; on the contrary there is a very close logical connection and a consecutive flow of thought in these poems, and that this is not always apparent is owing to this very alphabetical structure, which sometimes breaks up and interrupts the sense, and is in this respect an actual hinderance to the natural and proper connection of sentiment and expression. It is, therefore, impossible that Jeremiah chose it for the purpose of supplying by artificial means the lack of logical connection in the subject matter of his poem. He must have been influenced by other considerations. What were they? We can, we think, specify three reasons, any one of which would justify his adoption of this style, and all of which probably combined in determining the external structure of this exquisite poem. 1. The assistance afforded by this alphabetical structure in maintaining the *rhythmical parallelism* of the poem. The parallelism of the Lamentations, as may be seen at a glance, is not the usual parallelism of thought and sentiment, so characteristic of Hebrew poetry: but it is strictly the parallelism of rhythm (see NOYES, *Introduction to Psalms*, pp. 43-46). "The simply rhythmical parallelism holds the most prominent place in the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Here the parallelism of thoughts is to be reckoned almost among the exceptions, and when it does occur, it is, for the most part, the subordinate parallelism of a member by itself; in general, the rhythm alone predominates, and that too with a regularity which is rare among Hebrew poets, producing here a suitable effect, namely, monotony of complaint" (NOYES, *ib.*, p. 45). This rhythm consists in dividing each verse into three members in chap. i., ii., iii., into two members in chap. iv., and in making each verse of chapter v. consist of one member, and in balancing each member with a *cæsura*, "which coincides with the sense and the accent," though "we are sometimes under the necessity of abandoning the accents, because they follow the sense, while the rhythm is independent of the sense" (NOYES). This peculiar construction gives to the Hebrew original "that conciseness and brevity" which, as HENDERSON remarks (*Introduction*, p. 277), it is impossible to exhibit in a translation. But rhythmical parallelism, as NOYES observes, "is too loose a form to retain an exuberant matter without passing over into the prosaic style." This is to be guarded against. In the absence of the parallelism of thoughts and sentiments, how shall the writer distinguish his poetry from mere prose composition, in which rhythm often occurs without constituting poetry? To meet this difficulty, the advantage of the artificial restraint of the alphabetical structure is obvious. At equal periods, both writer and reader are reminded, in the absence of parallel thoughts, that the rhythmical parallelism is ended, and is to begin anew. Thus the writer is checked and curbed, and saved from the fault of an inelegant redundancy of expression, while the reader is instructed to observe the proper inflections and to expect some new change of thought or expression. If the original was written without points, as doubtless it was, we can readily apprehend how almost necessary some such artificial help to correct writing and reading, as this alphabetical struc-

much the stranger is the contradiction into which he falls when he asserts (*S. 124*), that the expansion of the alphabetical structure in ch. iii., is 'an artificiality, to which only a less spiritual poet could confine himself, and which alone by itself repels the thought that Jeremiah could have composed this poem.' Very far from necessarily indicating a peculiarly artificial style, 'the alphabetical structure rather belongs to the means of giving to poetical writing the character of connectedness which is necessary to it' (HENGSTENBERG, *ib. loc.*), and has for its object 'to give to such songs, as do not allow of being rounded-off and finished by the internal development of the thoughts, the character of a complete composition by means of passing through the whole alphabet—the symbol of completeness' (KEIL in HAEVERNICK, *Eim.*, III. 8, 48, *vgl.*, 514)."

* LOWTH: "The acrostic or alphabetical poetry of the Hebrews was certainly intended to assist the memory, and was confined altogether to those compositions which consisted of detached maxims or sentiments without any express order or connection" (GREGORY'S *Trans.* II., *Lect.* 22, p. 134). GERLACH with dogmatic positiveness denies that the object of this form was "of the external sort, to assist the recollection of the learners, as HUET, LOWTH, and lately THENIUS assume." It could not fail, however, to facilitate the memorizing of the poems thus written; and in an age when the recitation of poems from memory was the prevailing fashion, and in lyrical poems the recitations were sung, rather than pronounced, to the accompaniment of music, the alphabetical structure possessed advantages that the greatest poets would not despise. GERLACH is also at fault, when, like LOWTH, he would confine the use of the alphabetical structure to the connection of detached sentences or thoughts only loosely related to each other.

ture afforded, may have been. It is not impossible that the poem, as originally written, could not have been intelligibly read, without great difficulty, but for this artificial and alphabetical arrangement. 2. This artificial structure gives to the Poem an expression of unity and completeness. The five songs, each of twenty-two verses, four of them alphabetically arranged, the middle one repeating the alphabet three times, the last one, not alphabetical, but short, rapid and metrical, compose a symmetrical whole, that would be vitiated by any structural change whatever. Even through the eye, this external form, when clearly written, must have conveyed to the mind a conviction that the five Songs composed one poem. The visual effect was an aid to the intellectual apprehension of the design and spiritual purport of the poem. It is one, and only one.* The architectural idea suggested by NÆGELSBACH is thus perfected, a temple rising to the crowning dome supported by the well proportioned columns that rest on a common foundation. Or we may imagine our poem a Jacob's ladder, each golden round of which is denoted by a letter; as this ladder rises from earth to heaven, the separate steps, at first wide apart, grow closer together, and then their distinctive marks are lost to sight and we can only see that the top of the ladder is overshadowed with the glory of God amidst the clouds of incense of prayer and adoration. These illustrations, if deemed over fanciful, may yet serve to show how the alphabetical structure of the poem assists our conception of it as a whole, binds together its separate parts and gives it the expression of unity and completeness. 3. The alphabetical structure was a mechanical assistance to the writer, helping him to curb and control his own emotions and check the ebullitions of violent and turbulent grief. This is the view taken by the author of the article on Lamentations in Dr. WM. SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible*. He says, "the choice of a structure so artificial as that which has been described above, may at first sight appear inconsistent with the deep intense sorrow of which it claims to be the utterance. Some wilder, less-measured rhythm would seem to us to have been a fitter form of expression. It would belong, however, to a very shallow and hasty criticism to pass this judgment. A man true to the gift he has received will welcome the discipline of self-imposed rules for deep sorrow as well as for other strong emotions. In proportion as he is afraid of being carried away by the strong current of feeling, will he be anxious to make the laws more difficult, the discipline more effectual. Something of this kind is traceable in the fact that so many of the master-minds of European literature have chosen, as the fit vehicle for their deepest, tenderest, most impassioned thoughts, the complicated structure of the sonnet; also in DANTE'S selection of the *terza rima* for his vision of the unseen world. What the sonnet was to Petrarch and to Milton, that the alphabetic verse system was to the writers of Jeremiah's time, the most difficult among the recognized forms of poetry, and yet one in which (assuming the earlier date of some of the [alphabetical] Psalms . . .) some of the noblest thoughts of that poetry had been uttered. We need not wonder that he should have employed it as fitter than any other for the purpose for which he used it." Bishop WORDSWORTH gives the same reason why Jeremiah adopted this form. "Like persons of strong emotions, he trembles at the power of his own passions, and resorts to mechanical helps, which may employ his attention, and may save him from being overcome by his feelings, and swept away by the strong tide and current of the violent impetuosity of his passions. As an Alpine traveller, skirting the sharp edge of a precipice, is not unthankful for the wooden hand-rail which runs along it, and by which he supports his steps if his eyes become dizzy at the sight of the dark deep gulf and the foaming cataract below him, so Jeremiah does not disdain to lean on artificial supports in the most vehement outbursts of his emotions. His Lamentations amid the ruins of Jerusalem are the most impassioned utterances of Hebrew poetry; and the alphabetical arrangement of the stanzas, which at first sight may seem to be a rigid mechanical device, was doubtless designed, not only as a help to the memory of his Hebrew fellow-countrymen, who would recite them in their captivity and dispersion, but also to be a stay and support to himself in his own vehement agitations" (*Introduction to Jeremiah*, p. xv.).

The vigor and vivacity of style have been urged as a reason why Jeremiah could not, in his old age, have composed the Lamentations. These we are told reveal a young man. The

* "In order to give to the Lamentations, ever expressed in new words, images and turns of thought, the character of completeness and of a connected production, these Songs are, with the exception of the last one, constructed alphabetically" (KEIL, *Einleitung des Alt. Test.*, § 126, p. 377).

expression in iii 27 is appealed to as a plausible evidence that the writer was young. This sage observation, however, "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth," is certainly the grave, mature reflection of an old man. The young are not apt to appreciate the benefits of affliction. It is the old man of long experience and long observation, who looking backward, as it is the habit of old men to do, discerns the wholesome discipline there was in the sorrows and trials of earlier years. In this very verse, therefore, as in the whole book, we recognize the tone and spirit of an aged man;—of a man who has, in fact, left hope in regard to the things of this world behind him, and exchanged it for a sublime faith in the fulfilment of Divine purposes and promises in a future that lies beyond the terminus of his own individual life-time,—such faith as bought the field in Anathoth, when the prophet was fully persuaded that he himself would derive no benefit from it.—But it is not certain that Jeremiah had arrived at an *extreme* old age when the Book of Lamentations was written. In the thirteenth year of Josiah, he speaks of himself as "a child." He may have been then as young as was Samuel, when *he* was called to the prophetic office, in which case Jeremiah would have been not more than fifty-three years of age when Jerusalem was destroyed. But had he been twenty years old in the thirteenth year of Josiah, he would have been just over sixty at the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the very prime of intellectual and moral vigor.—But granting the possibility that he might have been seventy or eighty years of age, or even older, it should not surprise us, that he, the prophet of God, writing by inspiration of the Spirit of God, should produce a book which is confessedly written with a mental force unabated and a versatility of genius unimpaired. Nor would it be "by any means a singular instance of a richer and mellower imagination at the close of life, than during its morning or its meridian. This for example was remarkably the case with the magnificent BURKE." The writer just quoted, speaking of the Book of Ecclesiastes and its aged author, says: "Solomon, at the close of his life here hived up the wisdom of past years for our instruction. * * The setting of the sun of the great Master of wisdom, whom God Himself made chief of learned men, threatened indeed to be enveloped with dark clouds, but its rays broke nobly forth before it passed below the horizon, and upon those clouds are painted the rich hues of mingled imagination and philosophy" (*Pres. Quart. Review*, Jan. 1861, Art. IV., p. 462). Jeremiah, too, at the close of life, compressed the spirit and the teachings of all his prophecies into one wondrous poem, excelling all he had before written in the vigor of its conception, and force, beauty and pathos of its expression. His life and his ministry had been like a stormy day. But that day was not abruptly ended, as was threatened, in the dark night of Jerusalem's destruction. For him there remained a protracted evening twilight, comparatively calm and tranquil, though sorrowful always and perturbed with some fitful returns of stormy experiences, as the animosities of Egyptians and Israelites against him, provoked by his prophecies in Tahpanhes, indicate (see Jer. xliii., xliv.): and in these chastened hours, before his life finally dissolved in tears, his genius gathered into one harmonious composition, the spirit and truth of his eloquent prophecies, to remain for ever the crown and glory of his ministry in the church of God.

We have shown that there is nothing in the style of the Lamentations incompatible with the belief that Jeremiah was their author. We are now to exhibit the evidences of certain similarities of style between Jeremiah's Prophecies and the Lamentations, which confirm our belief that both Books were the production of one author. 1. The individual temperament of Jeremiah, as evinced in his acknowledged writings, was precisely that of the elegiac poet of the Lamentations; occupied with the present and actual, rather than given to discursive flights into the regions of the distant and possible; sensitive, quick in susceptibility; ready to express his emotions and never concealing them, revealing "unreservedly the secret recesses and inmost working of his own heart" (WORDSWORTH); passionate in his grief, and prone to linger among the causes of his sorrow and brood over them and harp upon them; and tender-hearted towards others and sympathetic, throwing himself "unhesitatingly into the condition of those to whom he speaks" (WORDSWORTH). 2. The religious characteristics of Jeremiah reappear in the Lamentations. The same disposition to hold both God and the people firm to covenant engagements: the habit of tracing suffering to sin: the quick discernment of punishment, past or coming, on Jew and Gentile. What has been said of Jeremiah with reference to his prophecies, may be affirmed of the author of the Lamentations: "the Religion, the Monarchy

and the other Institutions of his country, seem to be absorbed and concentrated in him; and his own individuality is lost in sympathy with them. His prophetic sternness is a consequence of the intensity of his zeal for the glory of the God of Israel, and of his love for the People of the Lord" (WORDSWORTH, *Intr. Jer.*, p. xv.). 3. The following general "marks of style" have been indicated (see SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.*, art. *Jeremiah*) as characteristic of his prophetic writings, all of which are manifest, some of them very distinctly, in his Lamentations. Reminiscences and reproductions of what earlier prophets had written. Influences on his mind of the newly discovered law, and especially of the Book of Deuteronomy. A tendency to reproduce himself—to repeat in nearly the same words the great truths which affected his own heart, and which he wished to impress on the hearts of others. Analogies drawn "not from the region of the great and terrible, but from the most homely and familiar incidents (xiii. 1-11; xviii. 1-10)." 4. It is a striking peculiarity of Jeremiah, which we find repeated in the Lamentations, that the future deliverance of Israel is set forth under the form of the destruction of their enemies. Thus elegies, i., iii. and iv., end with predictions of the punishment of hostile nations, where we would expect an announcement of deliverance and salvation for Israel. Turn now to the prophecies of Jeremiah and read his predictions against Egypt (xli.), Philistia (xlvii.), Moab (xlviii.), Ammon, Edom, Syria, Kedar, Hazor, Elim (xlix.), and Babylon (l., li.). Do we not recognize the same prophetic spirit, and the same peculiar, characteristic recognition of the heathen nations in their "typical character, as representatives of various kinds of enmity against the church of Christ" (WORDSWORTH, *Intr. Jer.*, p. xiii.), so that their humiliation or destruction is tantamount to the glory and deliverance of the people of God? 5. Incidental evidences of the identity of the author of Jeremiah's prophecies and of the Lamentations, in many minute points of resemblance.—"As in the Prophecies of Jeremiah, so here, the causes of the exile of the people, and of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, are represented to be the vices and crimes of the covenant people (compare i. 5, 8, 14, 22; iii. 39, 42; iv. 6, 22; v. 16, with Jer. xiii. 22, 26; xiv. 7; xvi. 10-12; xvii. 1-3), their guilty reliance on false prophets and profligate priests (comp. ii. 14; iv. 13-15, with Jer. ii. 7, 8; v. 31; xiv. 13; xxiii. 11-40; xxvii. *etc.*), their false confidence of security in Jerusalem (comp. iv. 12, with Jer. vii. 4-15), their vain hope of the assistance of weak and perfidious allies (comp. i. 2, 19; iv. 17, with Jer. ii. 18, 36; xxx. 14; xxxvii. 5-10), HAEV. *Einl.*, S. 515" (KEIL, *Einleitung in A. T.*, § 127, p. 379).—"In both" (the prophecies of Jeremiah and the Lamentations) "we meet once and again, with the picture of the 'virgin daughter of Zion,' sitting down in her shame and misery (Lam. i. 15; ii. 13; Jer. xiv. 17). In both there is the same vehement outpouring of sorrow. The prophet's eyes flow down with tears (Lam. i. 16; ii. 11; iii. 48, 49; Jer. ix. 1; xiii. 17; xiv. 17). There is the same haunting feeling of being surrounded with fears and terrors on every side (Lam. ii. 22; Jer. vi. 25; xvi. 5). In both the worst of all the evils is the iniquity of the prophets and priests (Lam. ii. 14; iv. 13; Jer. v. 30, 31; xiv. 13, 14). The sufferer appeals for vengeance to the righteous Judge (Lam. iii. 64-66; Jer. xi. 20). He bids the rival nations that exulted in the fall of Jerusalem prepare for a like desolation (Lam. iv. 21; Jer. xlix. 12)" (SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.*, art. *Lamentations*).—Besides undeniable repetitions, there are many similarities of thought and structure. There are passages in the Lamentations that seem Jeremiah-like, echoes and suggestions of his prophecies, though we cannot always connect them with any particular utterance of that Prophet. Sometimes, again, the one distinctly and promptly suggests and recalls the others. For example. In Lam. i. 20, "Behold, O LORD, for I am in distress; my bowels are troubled; mine heart is turned within me," and in Lam. ii. 11, "my bowels are troubled within me, my liver is poured upon the earth," we recognize the man of whom it has been said—with reference to Jer. iv. 19, "My bowels, my bowels! I am pained at my very heart; my heart maketh a noise in me"—"through the chambers of his innermost heart there is a shudder" (EWALD, quoted by STANLEY). Lam. ii. 14, aside from its verbal similarities, could only have been written by the author of Jer. xxiii. 36-38. The same clarion voice that rung out the cry as if from the ramparts of Babylon in Jer. li. 12, is heard resounding from the broken walls of Jerusalem in Lam. ii. 17. He who arrested himself on the very verge of a criminal despair, when he wrote Lam. iii. 18 (see the Commentary), surely had in his mind the words he had before written in Jer. iv. 10 and xx. 7

And the author of Lam. iii. 10,—“He was unto me as a bear lying in wait, and as a lion in secret places,”—was only in imagination transferring to himself that perilous position, in which he had with grief and horror contemplated “the struggles of the expiring kingdom of Judah, like those of a hunted animal,—now flying, now standing at bay, between two huge beasts of prey, which, whilst their main object is to devour each other, turn aside from time to time to snatch at the smaller victim that has crossed their midway path.”

5. Last of all, and most conclusive as a rebutting argument to Dr. NAEGELSBACH's assertion, we have the striking verbal analogies between these two books. But now we come into direct collision with Dr. NAEGELSBACH's assertion, that the language is not the language of Jeremiah.

It would be a stronger argument to say that Jeremiah did not write Lamentations, because it introduces a great many thoughts and ideas not contained in his prophecies, than it is to urge the appearance of new words, or of old words in new combinations, not found in his prophecies. For it is notorious that men of letters have greater command of language than of thoughts, greater versatility in expressing the same thought in different words, than of infusing original ideas into old words. But Dr. NAEGELSBACH has succeeded in making his argument very imposing and formidable in appearance at least, by spreading out upon his pages a long list of assumed variations in language between Jeremiah's prophecies and the Lamentations. Only ten verses in the whole book have escaped his acute criticism, the results of which are all displayed to full advantage. While the patient labor evinced by this minute catalogue is to be commended, the reader will feel that Dr. NAEGELSBACH might have spared *him* the almost equal labor of entering into all the details of the work of investigation, by classifying its results under a few general heads. Had he done so, his pages would have presented to the eye at least, a less startling array of facts and instances,—but he himself might have discovered, in the process of generalization, that those facts and instances are more apparent to the eye than they are to the understanding. In reviewing this catalogue we ought, first of all, to remember that great differences in style and language, between two such books as the prophecies of Jeremiah and the Lamentations, even if the productions of one author, were to be expected; and then, secondly, we should inquire, whether the differences that do exist are such as are compatible, according to the rules of a just criticism, with their being the productions of one author. With regard to the first point, we should observe, that the prophecies, for the most part, have somewhat of the character of unpremeditated, extemporaneous effusions, designed to produce an immediate effect on the hearts and consciences of the king, the princes, priests, prophets and people. Therefore they were expressed in the common colloquial words, idioms and phrases of daily life. These prophetic deliverances often assumed the forms and diction of poetry. But it was the poetry of the orator, rather than of the writer. Eloquence always is poetical. This is especially true of oriental eloquence. But its poetry is the expression of impassioned thoughts in language imaginative and ornate, spontaneously and unconsciously falling into harmonious cadences, that with us who speak the English language grow into rhythmical periods, but with the Hebrews passed into parallelisms and regularly constructed sentences, divided by cesuras and accents into parts corresponding more or less accurately in length. Such is the poetry we find in the prophecies of Jeremiah; touching our hearts by their pathos, as in the weeping Rachel, refusing to be comforted, or in the plaintive cry, *Is there no balm in Gilead, no physician there?* or in the outburst of his own grief, when he exclaims, “Oh, that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people;” again delighting us with beautiful imagery, as by the heath in the desert, the wayfaring man, the athlete wearied by the footmen before he contends with the horses; or overwhelming us with the grandeur and sublimity of his conceptions, as in chapter fourth, where he depicts “the tokens attesting the forthcoming of the Lord to vengeance. Chaos comes again over the earth. Darkness covers the heavens. The everlasting mountains tremble. Man disappears from below and the birds fly from the darkened air. Cities become ruins, and the fruitful places wildernesses, before the advancing anger of the Lord. Byron's *Darkness* is a faint copy of this picture,—it is an inventory of horrible circumstances, which seem to have been laboriously culled and painfully massed up. Jeremiah performs his task with two or three strokes; but they are strokes of lightning” (GILFILLAN: *Bards of the Bible*).

Jeremiah's Prophecies contain much real poetry, not only such in virtue of intensity of feeling and vividness of illustrative description, but in virtue of the parallelisms and alternating sentences, which mark Hebrew poetry as distinctly as rhythm and rhyme do English poetry. Even unpoetic translators have felt compelled to give it the external garb of poetry, by marking its periods with lines, though some, like our own lamented Dr. J. ADDISON ALEXANDER, have ineffectually protested against ever arraying Hebrew in these modern vestments. But, after all, the poetry of Jeremiah's Prophecies is the production of a Hebrew orator, rather than of a Hebrew writer. The fourth chapter, for instance, from which the description of the coming judgment is taken, was a fervent address to the people, designed to stir them up to repentance. It was a sermon, an exhortation, a prophetic message from God to His Church. Its poetical features were incidental to its impassioned style. The same remarks will apply to all the poetical portions of the Book; and much of the Book is undeniably simply prose, historical or ethical. Throughout he seeks, not poetical, but oratorical effect. He speaks, not as the poet, but as the preacher. Unlike the Prophecies, the Lamentations are in the strictest sense a poem. This poem was composed in circumstances very different from those in which the Prophecies were produced, and for a very different purpose. The prophet-preacher and orator had fulfilled his unsuccessful mission and retired in a measure from public view. He was in exile with that portion of his countrymen who had fled to Egypt. Here he, who had passed the whole of the former part of his life amidst the excitements and agitations of events more critical and important than any that had occurred in the history of the Jews since they entered on possession of the promised land, now in his old age experienced comparative quiet and leisure. There were, it is true, sorrow and suffering enough around him. The fifth chapter of the Lamentations affords hints of these, and the first chapter tells us how "the pursuers overtook them in the straits." Yet life in that Egyptian exile was stagnation compared with the turbulent history of the prophet's former years. The venerable and broken-hearted man had time now for careful composition. He improved the melancholy hours in the production of a lyrical poem, in which his object was, not as in his prophecies, to produce some immediate effect upon his countrymen, but to publish to the world such a description of God's judgments on Israel, as should redound to the glory of God and convey lessons of wisdom and piety to the Church in all time to come. Everything in this poem shows premeditation and pains-taking in the execution, such as we might expect of the prophet in the circumstances in which he was placed. He imposed upon himself the most artificial rules then practised by the writers of poetry, either by his own preference, or to adapt his poem to the prevailing tastes of the Hebrew people. The initial letters of the verses were to be alphabetically arranged, and in the middle chapter or song the alphabet was to be thrice repeated by giving the same initial letter to every clause of each verse; each verse of the first three chapters was to consist of three periods, or members, the fourth chapter of two, and the fifth of one, agreeing externally with what Dr. NAEGELSBACH has described, in musical terms, as a *crescendo* and *decrecendo* movement; and each period or member of a verse was to be composed of two parts, clearly marked, both to the mind and ear, by a pause. These were the rules or laws of composition adopted. Yet these artificial restraints were to be so managed that they should not interrupt the continuity of thought, prevent harmony of expression, or destroy the unity that should characterize the five songs as the component parts of one perfect poem. To fulfil all these requirements, a careful choice of words and phrases was imperative. Deliberation was necessary at every step. And the Poet must go beyond the resources of his accustomed dialect and habit of speaking and writing, and cull from the whole Hebrew language the words, idioms and expressions that best suited his purpose. The result inevitably was the occurrence in this poem of a phraseology that is nowhere else found, either in the prophecies of the same author, or in any other single Book of the Holy Bible. How could it be otherwise? We think, therefore, that it ought to be assumed and granted, as a foregone conclusion, that the Lamentations, even if written by Jeremiah, should contain words, phrases, and turns of thought expressed by a novel use of words, nowhere produced in his book of prophecies. Granting this, we are next to ask, whether the verbal differences between the prophecies of Jeremiah and the Lamentations are of such a character as to compel us to the decision that they could not be the productions of the same author? For a full answer to this question, we must refer to the remarks made upon

these verbal differences, as they occur, in the following commentary. But a sufficient answer is contained in the statement, that all these differences may be explained, consistently with the presumption that Jeremiah is the author of this book, by a due consideration of the following rules, or laws of construction. In the application of these rules, frequent reference will be made to the poems of SHAKSPEARE compared with his plays. The choice of these poems for this purpose is induced by the fact that Mrs. CLARK'S *Concordance to Shakspeare's Plays* enables us to detect what is new and peculiar in his poems as compared with his plays. Time has not allowed a full examination of these poems. Only some thirty verses of the two larger poems, "Venus and Adonis," and "Tarquin and Lucrece," have been subjected to a rapid investigation. We should not expect as many verbal discrepancies between the plays and poems of SHAKSPEARE, as may exist between the Prophecies and Lamentations of Jeremiah, for two reasons. The plays of our English poet are so voluminous that they might be expected to exhaust even *his* vocabulary, while the prophecies of Jeremiah could not possibly call into use all the words and expressions at the command of a writer or speaker of even ordinary fluency. And again, there is less difference between the blank verse of SHAKSPEARE'S plays and the rhymed verse of his poetry, than there is between the poetry of the Prophecies and that of the Lamentations. SHAKSPEARE had occasion to employ over and over again in his dramas the very words that must be repeated in his poems: while Jeremiah would need for his Lamentations a diction to a great extent unlike that in which his Prophecies were composed. Yet in the very first stanza of Venus and Adonis, consisting of six lines, there are four instances of words or expressions that do not occur in the plays of the dramatist, *purple-colored face, weeping morn, hied, sick-thoughted*, and two that occur only once in his plays, *rose-cheeked and bold-faced*. In the first stanza of Tarquin and Lucrece, consisting of seven lines, there are three instances of words not found in the plays, *trustless, lust-breathing, and lightless*. With such facts as these before us, we ought to be prepared for great novelties in the style and language of the Lamentations. And yet we will find that what Dr. NAEGELSBACH has so elaborately spread out before us as novelties, may be classified under the following six heads.

(1). New combinations of words familiar to the writer and occurring with more or less frequency in his Prophecies. These seldom involve real differences in language and style, and it is unfair to cite them as such. They are in nearly every instance similarities in the habit of the writer's phraseology, that prove his identity. When we find in Venus and Adonis expressions like these, *loaded-satiety, time-beguiling, ashy pale, blue-veined, thick-sighted*, or, in Tarquin and Lucrece, *silver melting dew, high-pitched, all too timeless, death-boding*, do we doubt whether SHAKSPEARE wrote these poems, because these particular combinations of familiar words do not occur in his plays? The very first specifications of NAEGELSBACH are of this character, *עַם רַבְּתִי בְּנֵימִם* and *רַבְּתִי בְּנֵימִם*, i. 1. These are, in fact, indications of Jeremiah's authorship. For the writer who used the expression in Jer. li. 13, *רַבַּת אוֹצְרֵת*, *full of treasures*, would be very likely to say *עַם רַבְּתִי*, *full of people*; and the writer, who was accustomed to the use of *רַב* in the sense of *great* (Jer. xli. 1; xxxii. 19), would be very likely to follow the phrase *עַם רַבְּתִי* with this other phrase, involving a poetical play upon the word and a pleasant repetition of sound to the ear, *רַבְּתִי בְּנֵימִם*, *great among the nations*. To specify *כִּירִיב*, i. 3, as a peculiarity of style, is a species of literary trifling unworthy of the name of argument. Any writer might connect so common a preposition with a familiar noun. If Jeremiah did it only once, so Isaiah in all his writings uses this expression once, and only once (xxiv. 22). Besides, *כִּירִיב* occurs twenty-one times, scattered throughout the Bible from Genesis to Zechariah. *הִלָּן שָׁכֵנִי*, i. 5, involves a peculiarity of construction as likely to be perpetrated by the writer of Jer. xxii. 22 and xxx. 16, who says *יִלְכִי בְּשָׁכֵנִי*, as by any one else. Many of the specifications given by Dr. NAEGELSBACH fall under this first head, and are, in fact, strong evidences of Jeremiah's authorship.

(2). A word not occurring in Jeremiah's prophecies (perhaps not in any other Scriptures), simply because the idea it represents does not occur. Thus in i. 1, *שָׂרָה*, *princess*, is the only place in the whole Bible where a *princess* is distinctly indicated. Hence the word occurs only here. Is it fair to put this down as an indication of style? In fact, however, we claim the evidence of

this very word in behalf of the traditional theory. For the word in the plural, שָׁרוֹת, *princesses*, was familiar to Jeremiah in the other Scriptures. If he never used it in his prophecies, it was because he had no occasion to do so: but he does use the verb from which it is derived and other derivatives from it; and so often does the word שָׂר, for a prince, ruler, chieftain, or distinguished person, occur in his prophecies, that we should expect the feminine form of that word, שָׂרָה, would be most likely to occur to the mind of the author of those prophecies, when, for the first time, he desired to speak of a princess.—The word כְּרִינָה, *province*, i. 1, does not occur in the prophecies, because Jeremiah had no occasion to use it in that book. In *Venus and Adonis* we read for the first time in SHAKSPEARE of a *dive dapper*, a much more uncommon word in English literature than כְּרִינָה is in Hebrew.—The word לֶחִי, *cheek*, i. 2, Jeremiah had no occasion to use in his prophecies. When for the first time he would speak of the cheek, what word should he use, but the only one used by the inspired Scriptures with which he was familiar? See Deut. xviii. 3; 1 Kings xxii. 24; (2 Chron. xviii. 23); Job xvi. 10; Cant. i. 10; v. 13; Is. i. 6; Mic. iv. 14. (The word occurs in thirteen other places, where it seems to mean *the jaw*.) This word, therefore, gives all the testimony that can be extracted from it, in favor of Jeremiah, and not against him.

(3). Forcible expressions that occur in other Scriptures extant in Jeremiah's times, which he, therefore, would not be unlikely to repeat; sometimes indeed they may be intended as quotations.—אֵין כֹּנֶחֶם, *there is no comforter*, i. 2. See Eccl. iv. 1. If Solomon years before had used the expression and given it currency in the Hebrew language, is it strange that Jeremiah repeated it? Or if Solomon was allowed to use it only once in the whole book of Ecclesiastes, without risking his title to the authorship of that book, may not Jeremiah be permitted to use it in only one chapter of all his writings? Or, if there is any thing in the argument at all, ought we not to conclude that the author of the first chapter of Lamentations could not have written the other chapters, because this unique expression occurs five times in the first chapter and not at all in the others?—הָיְתָה לְבָסִי, *became tributary*, i. 1. This phrase was familiar to Jeremiah in Gen. xlix. 15; Josh. xvi. 10; Deut. xx. 11, besides many similar expressions in the old Scriptures.

(4). Words so familiar to the common dialect of Jeremiah's times, that their use by him can occasion no surprise, though they do not occur in his prophecies.—We find in the *Venus and Adonis* words like the following, which do not occur in SHAKSPEARE's plays: *saddle bow*, *toy* as a verb, *stalled up* (he uses the noun *stall* often, the verb *stall* only once, but *stall up* never, a point our German critics would make very emphatic, if discussing the authorship of this poem), *unripe*, *overswayed*, *overruled* in the sense of ruling over another, *uncontrolled* in the sense of unconquered, *dishevelled*, *spright*, *souring*, *disliking* as an adjective, *etc.* Yet who that is acquainted with the literature of the times in which the great dramatist lived, discovers any thing remarkable in his use of these words? Neither should it surprise us that Jeremiah has happened not to use many current words in his prophecies, which he has chosen to use in the Lamentations. For example, מַעֲנִי, of which we shall speak again. עֲנִיָּה, i. 3, which occurs in Ex. twelve, in Lev. five, in Num. thirteen, in 1 Chron. eight, in 2 Chron. three, and in Ez. two times, and once in Gen., in Deut. and in Is. So כָּנֻחַ, i. 3, is found in Gen. viii. 9; Deut. xxviii. 65; Ruth iii. 1; 1 Chron. vi. 16; Is. xxxiv. 14.

(5). Slight grammatical variations, licenses allowed every poet; the use of a verb in a tense in which it does not happen to occur in the prophecies; the use of nouns as adjectives, or vice versa; and similar peculiarities.—i. 3, כָּנֻחַ instead of כָּנֻחָה; ver. 4, the ending יָן; ii. 13, רָפָא construed with לָ; ver. 14, חָזָה without שָׂא; iii. 6, Hiph. of פָּכַר, *etc.* As well might we question the authorship of *Venus and Adonis*, because SHAKSPEARE, often as he uses the verb *hie*, never in his plays has the preterite *hied*; nor *'miss* for misbehaviour; nor the participle *distilling*, though he has *distil* four times, *distilled* ten, *distillative* and *distilment* each once; nor the adjective *sappy*: nor the participle *souring*: or the authorship of *Tarquin and Lucrece*, because in the plays the adjectives made out of nouns, *trustless*, *lightless*, *bateless*,

do not occur; nor does the verb *stows*, though the participle *stowed* occurs three times; nor the verb *cypher*, though the noun does; nor the noun *blur*, though the verb does; nor do the participles *parling*, *pawning*. We must remember, too, that the inflections of Hebrew words, the changes produced by affixes and suffixes, and the omission or retention of vowel consonants, give a greater variety of grammatical forms than our English words can possibly undergo.

(6). The exactions of poetry, and especially of the very artificial structure of this poem.—Though the Lamentations may not be strictly rhythmical, yet the sentences are carefully balanced. There is, too, an evident regard to melody in the choice of words. עֲבָרָה and כְּנוּחַ in i. 3, each occurring at the cesura, and both harmonizing with other words in the verse, show that the phraseology was influenced by regard to melodiousness. In spite of the loss of the correct pronunciation of Hebrew, there can be no reasonable doubt of this. Thus we might account for שׁוֹמֵרִים, iii. 11, by the pleasing alliteration. The necessities of the alphabetical construction sometimes affected the choice of words, as we seem to see in the repetition of *vav* conversive in iii. 16–18, and of נָרַר in vers. 7 and 9. This may account for the abrupt introduction of the *bear*, רֶבֶב, in ver. 10, where the lion would have been quite sufficient, if the acrostic had not invited the bear to come too.

If, now, keeping these rules in mind, the following catalogue is carefully examined, there will be found in it little to weaken our confidence in the traditional opinion that Jeremiah wrote the Lamentations, and some things that will strengthen that belief.

When our fervent popular preacher leaves the pulpit, whence he had been accustomed to address the masses on the passing events of the day, or from which he poured forth instruction, warning, invective and exhortation adapted to produce immediate effects; and comes, as it were, to recite before a listening world a dirge on the fall of Jerusalem, that has been carefully prepared, according to the most artificial rules of poetry, known and practised in his day,—we expect to see him, not in his “home-costume,” but dressed for the occasion,—we expect, nay we demand, that his poem shall exhibit in its phraseology, as well as in its thoughts, the results of a careful premeditated selection of words and phrases, that may often lie beyond the habit of his customary “unconscious and undesigned” way of speaking and writing. Judged by this rule, even the long list of variations enumerated above, were they all found to be actual evidences of a difference of style, should not appal us or drive us to the conclusion that Jeremiah could not have been the author of Lamentations. But in point of fact, the long catalogue given above contains comparatively few evidences of even verbal differences between the prophecies of Jeremiah and the Book of Lamentations; and none that may not be explained consistently with the theory that Jeremiah wrote Lamentations. Take out of that catalogue all the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα (and Jeremiah’s prophecies will show such a list of these, as may raise the question whether their occurrence is not a characteristic of his style?); all the repetitions of the same word or phrase, as *there is no comforter*; all the words for which no synonym or equivalent occurs in the prophecies, and where of course the introduction of new words was inevitable, as *princess*, *province*, *cheek*; all the combinations of common words into new expressions that any writer of ordinary ability is constantly producing, and that do not really amount to peculiarities of diction, as *full of people*, *great among the nations*; and all slight grammatical changes that cannot be regarded as novelties in a writer who uses the same grammatical forms in other words, as the changes effected on words used in the prophecies by number, gender, mood, tense, or the particles attached to them, or the prepositions with which they are construed; remove all these from the catalogue, which ought to be thus sifted before we can reach the truthful result of our analysis, and we shall find little left on which to rest an argument against the authorship of Jeremiah. What the residuum would be, may be discovered in the twenty-four instances (see p. 13) on which Dr. NAEGELSBACH has taken his last stand, and which he evidently regards as constituting the strongest evidences in the whole Book that Jeremiah did not write it. These words then claim special attention. If it can be shown that they are not incompatible with the fact of Jeremiah’s authorship, it is not likely that any other words or phrases in the whole catalogue are. עֲלִיּוֹר appears only twice and then in close connection in Lam. iii. 35, 38. In both instances it seems to designate God (though some, as BLAYNEY,

give it a different sense in ver. 35); but it is applied to God as a descriptive title, rather than as a name. God is spoken of as the High One, He is not addressed as such. That the author of Lamentations does not call upon God by this title, by which He is designated in Deut. xxxii. 8, and in many of the Psalms, might be claimed as a coincidence between this book and the prophecies of Jeremiah. But the argument that Jeremiah would not be likely to apply to God a word he himself uses (xxii. 2; xxxvi. 10), and which is so constantly associated with God in the old Scriptures (see Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 20, 22; Num. xxiv. 16), and which Jeremiah the pious priest and prophet, must have so often used in the liturgical Psalms (vii. 18; ix. 3; xxi. 8; xlv. 5, *etc.*) is too feeble to withstand the first assault. The citation of the next word יְהוָה without any allusion to the question of its genuineness, does not seem entirely ingenuous. Certain it is that many MSS., some early editions and some of the older versions have יְהוָה instead of אֱלֹהֵי in every one of the fourteen places referred to in the Lamentations. The evidence in favor of this reading is so strong that in every instance BLAYNEY translates *Jehovah*, and BOOTHROYD, in his critical Hebrew Bible, marks אֱלֹהֵי as a *probable corruption*. If we consider the reluctance with which the Jews would regard the connection of the name of Jehovah with the judgments befalling themselves, we can imagine that doubts as to the יְהוָה and suggestions of אֱלֹהֵי, may have passed in the course of transcription from the margin into the text. But on the supposition that אֱלֹהֵי may be the true reading, it is not impossible to reconcile this with Jeremiah's authorship. Though Jeremiah may have preferred to connect with אֱלֹהֵי the name of הוָה, yet in this poem the artificial style (see Rule 6, p. 31) requiring short terse sentences may have forbidden his usual habit. Yet for the sake of variety of expression, or affected by that indefinable taste that guides the poet and which we may not be able always to detect in reading a foreign language, especially one the original pronunciation of which is lost, Jeremiah may have preferred to write אֱלֹהֵי alone, instead of יְהוָה alone. The likelihood that the choice of this word was influenced by the arbitrary rules of his poem may be inferred from the fact that the word always takes an important accent. Or again, Jeremiah may have been reluctant to connect the covenant name of God, the name associated with promise, grace and favor, with the fierce and destructive judgments that destroyed His own people and His own Temple. The remarks of WORDSWORTH on the use of this name in the prophecies give us a sufficient reason, if one is needed, why Jeremiah should depart from his usual custom and omit יְהוָה after אֱלֹהֵי: "The prophet appears thus to intimate in the Lamentations, that now, in her captivity and humiliation, Jerusalem felt the *lordship* of Jehovah, the God of Israel; but by reason of her *sins*, no longer felt that *lordship* to be exercised by Him as JEHOVAH, *i. e.* as the God of His covenanted people, to protect them" (note on Lam. i. 14). The other words need not detain us long. רָצָה occurs five times. Each time it is emphatic, and three times it is intended to intensify the meaning of רָצָה, i. 11, 12; v. 1. It is well chosen for this purpose, nor do the prophecies of Jeremiah suggest a word that both in form and sense would have been equally effective in these places. The word itself must have been familiar to Jeremiah and according to Rule 4, p. 30, cannot be regarded as a peculiarity of style. It occurs in Genesis three times, Exodus two, Numbers three, 1 Samuel four, 1 Kings three, 2 Kings once, 1 Chronicles once, Job three times, Psalms seventeen, Proverbs once, Isaiah fifteen times, Amos once, Habakkuk five times, and Jonah three. עָנִי and the verb from which it is derived עָנָה. This is not exactly accurate. Jeremiah uses the verb עָנָה in its usual meaning of *answering* frequently, vii. 13, 27; xi. 5; xiv. 7; xxiii. 35, 37; xxx. 3; xxv. 17; xlii. 4; xliv. 20: and the derivatives from it in that sense, עָנָה fourteen times, עָנָה eleven times. He also uses עָנָה in the intensive sense of *shouting*, xxv. 30; xi. 14. But what is more to our purpose is, that once at least he uses the derivation עָנִי, *poor, miserable*, xxii. 16, from עָנָה in the sense of being *bowed-down, oppressed*. He thus at least recognizes the root of עָנִי, and if in only one single verse of his prophecies we find עָנִי, *miserable*, shall we be surprised that in only one part of his writings we find עָנִי, *affliction*? Besides, this word also, according to Rule 4, p. 30, cannot be regarded as a test of au-

thorship. See Gen. xvi. 11; xxix. 32; xxxi. 42; xli. 52; Ex. iii. 7, 17; iv. 31; Deut. xvi. 3; xxvi. 7; Isa. xlviii. 10, and other books of the older Scriptures. שִׁיבָה. This word may be regarded as quite characteristic of Jeremiah; for he uses it in so many of its forms: in Kal *pret.* ii. 12; *ful.* xviii. 16; xix. 8; xlix. 17; l. 13; in Niphal *pret.* iv. 9; xii. 11; *part.* xxxiii. 10; in Hiphil *pret.* x. 25; *ful.* xlix. 20. Why then may he not also use it in Kal participle (see Rule 5, p. 31), especially since he had before him the examples of 2 Sam. xiii. 20; Isa. xlix. 8, 19; liv. 1; lxi. 4 *bis*, and since his cotemporary Ezekiel twice used this participial form, xxxvi. 3, 4? (See Rule 4, p. 30). יָנָה. Jeremiah uses the derivative יָנִיחַ, viii. 18; xx. 18; xxxi. 13; xlv. 3; and was familiar with the verb (Rule 4, p. 30) in Isa. li. 23; Job xix. 2 and his cotemporary Zephaniah iii. 18. אָנַח. See Joel i. 18; Ex. ii. 23; Prov. xxix. 2, which passages may have been in his mind (see Rule 3, p. 30). See the word also (Rule 4, p. 30) in Isa. xxiv. 7; Ez. ix. 4; xxi. 11 *bis*, 12. נָחַח is used three times, the first time as the initial word of ii. 7, when the mind of the writer would be going out in search of a suitable word, and not following the unconscious flow of thought and expression; see Rule 6, p. 31. Having used it once, it would readily occur to him again, when the sense suited; and it may be observed that the second time it is used, it stands as an initial word, iii. 17, just where an unusual word would be expected, although the initial letter of its root is not there required. How familiar it was to the dialect of his times (Rule 4, p. 30) may be judged from Hosea viii. 3, 5 and its occurrence in many Psalms and in the Chronicles. חָטָא here again we have a word first appearing as an initial, i. 8, and once repeated, iii. 39, to which the remarks made on last word will apply. It might be said that חָטָאת, which is used in the prophecies, would have afforded the proper initial letter. חָטָא may have been preferred for its brevity, and as a matter of taste on account of חָטָאָה immediately following. Its frequent occurrence in the Pentateuch and its use by Amos and Isaiah would meet the requirements of Rule 4. As there is an acknowledged mistake in the K'thib iii. 39, it is not impossible that the correct reading *there* is חָטָאת instead of the accepted K'ri. מַחְמֵר. Jeremiah in his prophecies uses מַחְמֵר only three times and then in an abstract sense, iii. 19; xii. 10; xxv. 34. The use of מַחְמֵר in Joel iv. 5; Cant. v. 16; Hos. ix. 6, 16, seems to designate that word as better chosen for the idea meant to be expressed. See Rule 4 above. בָּלַע, here again we have a word first occurring as an initial ii. 2, where the Poet is deliberately choosing the best and most forcible word for his purpose and not writing unconstrainedly. The Prophet once uses the verb in the Kal, li. 34. May he not then use it in the Piel, when *that* form is better suited to his purpose, especially since Habakkuk and Isaiah and older writers set him the example?

חָמַל, ii. 2, 17. Because Jeremiah once said לֹא נָחַם, xx. 16, and once נִחַמְתִּי, iv. 28, are we to assume that he could not twice say לֹא חָמַל? The argument is not only worthless, it is truthless, for Jeremiah does say, xiii. 14, לֹא אֶחְמֹל, and xxi. 7, לֹא יִחְמַל, besides often using the word חָמַל. We claim this phrase, therefore, as distinctively characteristic of Jeremiah. עָפָר, *dust*, ii. 10. Could not Jeremiah repeat a word made classical in Job ii. 12, יִיֶרְקֵי עָפָר, and write עָל־רֹאשָׁם, and write עָל־רֹאשָׁם? See Rule 3, p. 30. But it so happens that Jeremiah in his prophecies has no occasion to use an equivalent word, he does not speak of the *dust*, and therefore according to Rule 2, p. 29, this is no indication of his habit of speech. עָטָר. This word occurs only in Genesis, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Jonah and Lam. The Niphal form is found only in Lam. ii. 11, the Kal. *part.* plural, in Gen. xxx. 42, Lam. ii. 19, the Hithpael in Jon. ii. 8, Lam. ii. 12. We can imagine no valid reason why Jeremiah might not have used it. חִזָּה, which occurs twice in ii. 14, is not found in the prophecies of Jeremiah, but its derivative חִזִּיחַ is, Jer. xiv. 14, xxiii. 16. It is used by Isaiah often, by Amos, Micah, Habakkuk and Ezekiel, and is also found in the Pentateuch, in Job, Psalms and Proverbs. See Rule 4, p. 30. מִצָּה occurs twice, ii. 16, iii. 46, both times as an initial word. See Rule 6, p. 31, and with the same connecting words. If the word does not occur in the prophecies of

Jeremiah, neither is the same idea exactly expressed. Hence they contain no equivalent for this expression of *opening the mouth against one*. See Rule 2, p. 29. We have the same words in Ps. xxii. 14. פָּצָה with פֶּה is used Gen. iv. 11; Deut. xi. 6; Num. xvi. 30. See the word also in Jud. xi. 35, 36; Job xxxv. 16; Isa. x. 14; Ez. ii. 8; Ps. lxvi. 14; cxliv. 10, 11. Rule 4, p. 30. חֹשֶׁךְ. Jeremiah in his prophecies seems to have had occasion to use a substantive for *darkness* only three times; and each time he used a different one, xiii. 16, עֲרֵפֶל; xxiii. 12, אֶפְלָה; ii. 31, מַאֲפֵלָה. It cannot be said, therefore, that any one of these words was characteristic of his style, but on the contrary, the choice of a new word, so far as the evidence goes, is characteristic of his style. Besides, he uses the verb חָשַׁךְ, and was familiar with the noun in the sacred Scriptures. See Rule 4. Nor is it improbable, as NAEGELSBACH himself suggests, that the words חָשַׁךְ וְלֹא אִור, in Am. v. 18, 20; Job xii. 25, were in his mind. See Rule 3, p. 30. נִגְנֶה. Jeremiah did not use this word in the prophecies, because he had no occasion to do so. In that book there is no equivalent for it. See Rule 2, p. 29. He found the word ready for him when he wanted it, in Job, Psalms, Isaiah and Habakkuk. See Rule 4. יָחַל. See again Rule 4.

נָשָׂא פִּי. This phrase is frequent elsewhere, as Dr. NAEGELSBACH allows. See Rule 4. And observe, moreover, how the use of the expression is induced by the poetry. The initial word of the verse, iv. 16, is פִּי, this is repeated in the second member to mark the parallelism. The whole construction of the verse is verbally artful, and should we grant that the phrase is not idiomatic with Jeremiah, we could still account for his use of it in this particular passage. לָמוּ. This is simply a rare form that might be adopted by Jeremiah, as well as another. See Gen. ix. 26, 27; Isa. xlv. 15; liii. 8; Ps. xxviii. 8. שְׁ *relat.* The use of this prefix is characteristic of Ecclesiastes and the Canticles, yet if Solomon was the author of those books, and also of the Proverbs and the seventy-second Psalm, he could at pleasure drop this peculiarity. Why then may not Jeremiah be allowed to use the abbreviated relative four times in the Lamentations, without impeaching his title to its authorship? "The occurrence of אֲשֶׁר in Judg. v. 27 casts no suspicion on the genuineness of that verse, though שְׁ is used elsewhere in the Song of Deborah, ver. 7. Nor, on the other hand, does a single שְׁ, where אֲשֶׁר is the prevailing form, discredit Gen. vi. 3, or Job xix. 29" (LANGE's *Song of Sol. Introd.* § 1, Dr. GREEN's note). The constant tendency to rhythm, at least the terseness of style, is sufficient for the adoption of a form here, which the less compressed poetry of the Prophecies did not require. The abbreviations 'gan and 'miss both occurring near the beginning of Venus and Adonis, constitute no ground on which to rest an argument with reference to the author of that poem. See Rule 6, p. 31. Finally, בִּקְרֵב *without a suffix*. This happens once in the Lamentations, iii. 45. The same thing happens elsewhere in the Old Testament *sixty-one* times, in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Joel, Amos, Micah and Habakkuk; and Jeremiah himself is once imprudent enough to use בִּקְרֵב, vi. 1, without a suffix.—The conclusion to which we are forced, after this too patient examination is, that the phraseology of the Lamentations is beyond all doubt compatible with the tradition that Jeremiah the Prophet was their author.

On the other hand, there are striking verbal analogies between the book of the Prophecies of Jeremiah and the Book of Lamentations, sufficient of themselves to convince us, that the two Books are the productions of one author. What has been remarked of Jeremiah's writings generally is found to be true of the Lamentations also,—“his language abounds in Aramaic forms, loses sight of the fine grammatical distinctions of the earlier Hebrews, includes many words not found in its vocabulary (EICHORN, *Eint. in das A. T.*, III. 121),” (SMITH's *Bib. Dict.*, art. *Jeremiah*). CARL FRIEDRICH KEIL, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, gives us the following specimens, by way of example, of characteristic words and phrases common to both books. מְנִירִי, ii. 22, compare with מְנִירִי מְנִירִי, Jer. vi. 25; xx. 3, 10; xlv. 5; xlix. 29; the frequent use of שָׁבַר and שָׁבַר בַּת-עֵינִי, ii. 11, 13; iii. 47, 48; iv. 10, compared with Jer. iv. 6, 20; vi. 1, 14;

viii. 11, 21; xiv. 17; xxx. 12, *etc.*; גֵּר מִיָּם, or גֵּר דְּמִעָה, i. 16; ii. 11, 18; iii. 48, 49, compared with Jer. viii. 23; ix. 17; xiii. 17; xiv. 17. Compare in full such passages as iii. 14, and Jer. xx. 7: iii. 15, and Jer. ix. 14; xxiii. 15: iii. 47, and Jer. xlviii. 43: iii. 52, and Jer. xvi. 16: iv. 21, and Jer. xxv. 15, 27: and i. 8, 9, and Jer. xiii. 21, 26. Besides, only a few peculiar words occur as גִּשְׁקָר, i. 14; יָעִיב, ii. 1; שָׁתָם, iii. 8; כָּפַשׁ, iii. 16; צָפַר, iv. 8; תִּנְאֲלָח, and מְנִיחַת-לֵב, iii. 65; and peculiar forms of words, as מִשְׁבֶּת, i. 7; כְּרִיחִים, ii. 14; פִּיגָה, ii. 18; iii. 49, *etc.*" (*Einleit.*, § 127, S. 379). We need only refer to Dr. NAEGELSBACH's own Commentary for abounding evidences of coincidences in the use of language in the two books. He makes incessant reference to Jeremiah for the explanation of words and phrases. He often, too, with a generous and honorable frankness that we respect and admire, acknowledges that peculiar words and phrases found in Lamentations, occur also in Jeremiah, and sometimes in no other Hebrew writer. Since, then, it is conceded that much of the language of this book is characteristic of the writings of Jeremiah, and since we have shown above, that words and phrases used in this Book, and not found in Jeremiah's Prophecies, are not so numerous and of such a character as to render it incredible that Jeremiah wrote this Book, it is not necessary to delay the reader longer, but leave the further development of this argument to the following Commentary.

Paterson, N. J., Nov. 1870.

THE

LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.

CHAPTER I.

LAMENTATION OF THE DAUGHTER OF ZION OVER THE RUIN OF JERUSALEM AND JUDAH [OR RATHER, THE LAMENTATION OF THE DAUGHTER OF JERUSALEM OVER THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CITY, THE NATION AND THE TEMPLE.—W. H. H.].

[The song is naturally divided into two parts of equal length. Vers. 1-11 *describe* the wretched condition of the city. Vers. 12-22 are, more strictly, the lamentation over this condition. In both sections the speaker is the ideal person of the genius or daughter of the city, who twice, vers. 9, 11, interrupts the description of the first section, which is given in the third person, with an outcry of pain uttered in the first person.—W. H. H.]

I. VERS. 1-11.

- ⌘ VER. 1. How sitteth solitary
The city that was full of people!
She is become as a widow!
She that was great among the nations,
A Princess over the Provinces,—
Is become tributary.
- ⌘ VER. 2. Bitterly she weepeth in the night,
And her tears are [constantly] upon her cheeks.
She hath no comforter
From among all her lovers:
All her friends have dealt treacherously with her,
They have become her enemies.
- ⌘ VER. 3. Judah is gone into exile,
From oppression and from heavy bondage.
She dwelleth among the heathen:
She hath not found rest:
All her pursuers have overtaken her
Amidst her straits.
- ⌘ VER. 4. The ways to Zion are mournful
Because none come to her appointed services.
All her gates are destroyed.
Her priests sigh:
Her virgins are sorrowful:
And she, herself,—is in bitterness!
- ⌘ VER. 5. Her adversaries are exalted,
Her enemies prosper.
For Jehovah hath afflicted her
For the greatness of her sins.
Her young children are gone captives
Before the adversary.

- 1 VER. 6. And departed from the daughter of Zion
 Is all her beauty.
 Her princes have become like harts
 That find no pasture,
 And go, without strength,
 Before the pursuer.
- 2 VER. 7. Jerusalem remembers, in the days of her tribulation and of her wanderings,
 All her pleasant things that she had in the days of old.
 When her people fall by the hand of the adversary
 And there is no helper for her,—
 Her adversaries behold her—
 They mock at her Sabbaths!
- 3 VER. 8. Jerusalem has grievously sinned;
 Therefore is she become vile.
 All, who honoured her, despise her,
 For they see her nakedness.
 Yea, she herself sigheth
 And turneth backward.
- 4 VER. 9. Her filthiness is on her skirts.
 She considered not her end,
 Therefore she came down wonderfully
 She has no comforter.
 Behold, O Jehovah, my affliction,
 For the enemy magnifieth himself.
- 5 VER. 10. His hand has the oppressor stretched out
 Over all her precious things:
 For she saw heathen
 Come into her sanctuary:
 Of whom Thou didst command
 ‘That they come not into Thy congregation.’
- 6 VER. 11. All her people sigh,
 Seeking for bread;
 They give their precious things for food
 To sustain life.
 See, Jehovah, and consider
 How wretched I am become!

ANALYSIS.

The logical construction is preserved, although rendered difficult by the constraint of the alphabetical arrangement of the verses. From ver. 1 to the last clause of ver. 11, the poet speaks. [Rather the poet puts this language into the mouth of a third person, who is revealed to us in vers. 9, 11, and still more plainly in the whole of the second part, vers. 12–22, as the ideal representative of the ruined city.—W. H. H.] Vers. 1, 2 present to us the ideal person of Jerusalem, sharply defining the contrast between what she was and what she is now. Ver. 3 personifies in like manner the tribe of Judah. Vers. 4–6 depict the present condition of Jerusalem in ruins, in the midst of which description the ideal person in her grief is introduced; and also, by way of contrast, her successful foe: the forsaken roads of the city, the broken gates, the mourning priests and virgins, the exiled people, and especially the nobles plunged from splendor into the deepest misery, are the separate features which compose this picture. [The especial subject of this description is not the city, strictly speaking, but Zion, the crown and glory of the city. Around the ideal daughter of Zion all the accessories of the picture are drawn. Jerusalem, herself, is the immediate subject of the following verses.—W. H. H.] Ver. 7 relates again to the ideal Jerusalem and informs us how she remembers with pain her former estate, whilst now suffering bitter mockery from her foes. Vers. 8, 9 declare the cause of the judgment, already indicated in ver. 5, namely, the heinous sin of Israel: in consequence of which sin, heathen, ver. 10, had intruded into the sanctuary of Zion, which was forbidden in the law. Finally, ver. 11, to the last clause, describes the distressing famine of the besieged people. From the last clause of ver. 11 to the end of the chapter, the Poet lets Zion herself speak, as she had already done parenthetically in ver. 9.

VERS. 1, 2.

- 1 How doth the city sit solitary, *that was* full of people! *how* is she become as a widow! She *that was* great among the nations, and princess among the provinces,
2 *how* is she become tributary! She weepeth sore in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks; among all her lovers she hath none to comfort her: all her friends have dealt treacherously with her, they are become her enemies.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 1.—כָּרָר, subst., *solitariness*, is to be regarded as in the accusative. See iii. 23; Lev. xiii. 46; Jer. xv. 17; xlix. 31, לָכָרָר, Num. xxiii. 9; Mic. vii. 14.—רַבְתִּי. The ׀ is archaic. See OLSH., §123, d. [In שָׂרְתִי also. The paragogic ׀ was, originally, perhaps, a mark of the genitive, as the corresponding letter in Arabic. Occurs in poetry and in compound names, as אֶלְנִי-בִנְקֹן. HENDERSON.] The archaic ׀, not infrequent in Jeremiah, x. 17 (K'tib); xxii. 23; xlix. 16; li. 13. Yet this particular word occurs only here.—רַב, *great*, in the qualitative sense, not merely *multus*, but also *magnus, potens*, great, powerful, occurs often; Ps. xlviii. 3; Is. lxix. 1; Hii. 12; Jer. xli. 1. See רַב טַבָּחִים, *et sim.*, and רַבָּה, the metropolis of the Ammonites. The phrase רַב בְּנוֹיִם occurs only here. [See *Intr., Add. Rem.* (1). p. 29.—The ׀ after שָׂרְתִי indicates the object over which the Princess rules. See FUERST. [BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, translate *over*, instead of *among*.]—שָׂרָה is synonymous with רַבָּה, e.g., שָׂר טַבָּחִים, Gen. xxxvii. 36; xxxix. 1, *et al.*, and שָׂר כְּרִיסִים, Dan. i. 7, 9, *et al.* are synonymous with רַב וְ כִי וְ רַב טִי. The sing. שָׂרָה excepting as the proper name *Sarah*, occurs only here. Plural in Judges v. 29; Is. xlix. 23; 1 Kings xi. 3; Esth. i. 18, shows that it is an old word and in earlier times peculiar to poetry. [See *Intr., Add. Rem.* (2). p. 29.]—כִּרְיָה, *province, satrapy*, in *sing.* occurs only in books of Ezra (ii. 1), Nehemiah (i. 3; vii. 6; xi. 3), Ecclesiastes (v. 7), Daniel (viii. 2; xi. 24), and especially Esther (i. 1, 22; iii. 12, 14, *etc.*) in *plu.* in Esth. i. 3; vii. 9; ix. 3, 4, 10; Ezek. xix. 8; 1 Kings xx. 14, 15, 17, 19 (*not* 2 Kings xx. 19, a mistake of FUERST copied by NAEGELSB.), Eccles. ii. 8. Its use in Ezekiel and Kings shows that it was not unknown in the time of Jeremiah. [See *Intr., Add. Rem.* (2). p. 30.]—כָּס. W. ROBERTSON, *Key to Heb. Bib.*, derives from כָּס, *to melt, dissolve*, “a consuming of strength, *virtutis dissolutio et confectio*.” FUERST, from same verb taken in a secondary signification, *to split, divide, separate, sunder*, hence *metaph.* *to number, measure, distribute*. The only evidence of such a secondary signification of the verb is in the derivatives themselves, כָּס and כִּסָּה. The old quaint idea seems better. “כָּס from כִּסָּה, because it doth melt and dissolve, as it were, the substance of those who are forced to be tributaries.” GESSENIUS says this is not “tolerable,” and derives from כָּס *to number*. But there is a word already from that root, כִּכָּס, meaning *tribute* in the strict sense, while כָּס means any sort of *tribute-service* or *bond-service* (see *crit. notes below*), having a sense that cannot be extracted from a verb signifying *to number*.—W. H. II.]

Ver. 2.—בָּכָה. The infinitive construct before a finite verb expresses intensity, after it continuity. *She weepeth sore or sorely*, BROUGHTON, E. V., BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, or *bitterly*, NOYES, not *continually*, as old ENG. VERS., DIODATI, FRENCH VERS., WORDSWORTH, and NAEGELSBACH.—W. H. II.]—לְחִי never occurs in Jeremiah. [See *Intr., Add. Rem.* (2). p. 30.]—Jeremiah uses the Piel בָּחַס, xvi. 7; xxxi. 13; but not the phrase אֵין כְּנָחִים occurring in this chapter four times, and elsewhere only in Eccl. iv. 1. [See *Intr., Add. Rem.* (3). p. 50.] Jeremiah uses אֶהְיֶה xx. 4, 6; xxix. 23; v. 8; vii. 5, *etc.*; iii. 8, 11, 20; v. 11; xii. 6, *etc.*; אֶבֶב, frequently, vi. 25; xv. 11; xviii. 17, *etc.*—לְאֵבִים—הֵי occurs elsewhere only in Ps. cxxxix. 22.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **How**, אֵיכָה. The second and fourth chapters also begin with this word. It is used by Jeremiah (viii. 8; xlviii. 17), and not seldom in Deuteronomy (i. 12; vii. 17; xii. 30; xviii. 21). In Isaiah it occurs once, i. 21, a passage which seems to have been in our Poet's mind. *There*, as here, the ideal person of Jerusalem, i. e., of the city of Jerusalem (in distinction from the tribe of Judah, to which ver. 3 relates), is the subject. The personification is apparent: 1. From the expression, *sits solitary*. 2. From the words, *as a widow*. The comparison with a person shows that the subject of comparison is regarded as a person. 3. The singular forms in ver. 2, *she weeps, her tears, her cheeks, etc.*, as certainly indicate a personification, as the plural forms would prove a reference to the concrete multitude of the exiles. The Poet then has in his eye, not, perhaps, the collective person of the exiled people, but the ideal person of the city of Jerusalem, now ruined. This person he sees in

the spirit, sitting solitary amidst the devastated holy places.—**Doth the city sit solitary.** *Solitary*, because she has lost her inhabitants, her children. This is evident from the antithesis,—the city *that was full of people*. [NOYES: “There are several Roman coins extant, representing on the one side the emperor Vespasian, and on the other a woman (the daughter of Zion) sitting upon the ground under a palm tree, in a mournful attitude, and having around her a heap of arms, shields, *etc.* The legend is *ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑ CAPTA*—Judea taken.”]—**That was full of people!** In regard to sense and construction, see Jer. li. 13; 1 Sam. ii. 5. [HENDERSON: “It is impossible to determine what was the extent of the population of ancient Jerusalem. Before the revolt under Rehoboam it must have been very great, especially during the celebration of the three annual festivals, when the males congregated there from all parts of the country: and even after that event, there is reason to believe that, as the metropolis of the southern kingdom, the number of inhabitants was considerable. It not only continued to be the resort of the tribes

of Judah and Benjamin, but was one of the principal mercantile cities of the East."—**How.** [The repetition of the *How* in the second and the last clauses of the verse, as in our English version, is not only unnecessary, but mars the rhythmical construction and interrupts the consecutive flow of thought. There is no more propriety in its repetition in ver. 1, than there would be in ver. 2, which in form and matter is a continuation of ver. 1. The particle, as used in the beginning of the verse, is ejaculatory, not interrogative. It rouses and directs attention, with fine poetical effect, to the image of the ideal Jerusalem, once representing a city full of people, now seen as a dejected woman, sitting solitary, as in the deepest grief. The attention thus gained, the description goes on to the end of ver. 2, adding feature to feature, and circumstance to circumstance, with admirable art and graphic power, till the picture is complete.—W. H. H.]—**Is she—she is become as a widow!** In Is. i. 21, the faithful city has become a harlot. Here, where we have a poem not of invective and denunciation, but of lamentation, the populous city has become as a widow. For she is no longer (בְּעֵלָה) a married one, since she no longer enjoys communion with Jehovah, her Husband (בַּעַל). See DELITZSCH on Isaiah liv. 1 sqq.). She is a woman forsaken (Is. liv. 6), and the reproach of widowhood (Is. liv. 6) rests upon her. The expression as a widow בְּאַלְמָנָה, as one forsaken, [widowed] implies that Jerusalem has not lost her husband utterly and forever, but she is only separated from him for a period. There is in the particle as a foreshadowing of reunion. See the expression as widows in v. 3.—**She that was great among the nations.** [Dr. NAEGELSBACH's punctuation, which is the punctuation also of the Sept., Vulg., and some more modern versions, requires us to connect these words with the preceding declaration. She is become as a widow, the great one (Die Grosse) among the nations. This is, however, in violation of the masoretic punctuation, and does not seem to strengthen the meaning that Dr. N. derives from the expression as a widow. See critical notes below. Nor is there a necessary antithesis between being as a widow and having been great among the nations. If we adopt the punctuation of the Sept. and Vulg., we should adopt the translation in full of one or the other of those versions, both of which do preserve an antithesis. The Sept. reads *She is become as a widow, i. e., a lone, forsaken woman, who was filled with nations.* The Vulg. reads, *She the lady of nations became as a widow.* The punctuation in our present Hebrew Bibles, which is retained by our English version, BROUGHTON, GATTAKER, NOYES, and GERLACH, certainly makes the sense clearer and the thoughts more copious. The city sits solitary that was full of people! She is become as a widow! She that was great among the nations. . . . is become tributary.—W. H. H.]—**And princess among the provinces.** That not only Israelitish, but foreign provinces also, were at times governed by Jerusalem, is sufficiently established in history. [See David's conquests and sovereignty over the neighboring states, 2 Sam. viii. 1-4; x. 6-19; the ex-

tent of Solomon's dominions, 1 Kings iv. 21, 24; 2 Chron. ix. 23, 24; the power of Judah in the reign of Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xvii. 10, 11, and in that of Uzziah, 2 Chron. xxvi. 6-8. See also Ezra iv. 20, "There have been mighty kings also over Jerusalem, which have ruled over all countries beyond the river; and toll, tribute, and custom, was paid unto them."—W. H. H.]—**How is she become—is become.** [See remarks on *How* above.]—**Tributary.** ["Obliged to pay tribute-service. This is the common meaning of the word." NOYES.]

יָשְׁבָה בְּרָדָר, *sitteth solitary.* This cannot mean dwelleth alone. For the isolated location of the city could be no misfortune, since contact with heathen neighbors was forbidden as injurious. (See Num. xxiii. 9; Lev. xx. 24, 26; Deut. xxxiii. 23; Ex. xxiii. 31-33; Judg. ii. iii.) Nor can יָשְׁבָה have the sense of situation, place of location, for יָשָׁב never has that sense in the Hebrew. See GESEN., *Thes.* In Ps. cxvii. 5; cxv. 1; Zech. ii. 8; xii. 6; xiv. 10 it has either the active signification of inhabiting, or the passive of being inhabited (see Jer. xvii. 6, 25; xxx. 18; i. 13, 39, et al.). That this last named passive signification does not suit here is evident from the contradiction involved by the words *solitary* and *as a widow*. We can only translate *How sits solitary the city.* [FUERST, *Lex.*, "יָשָׁב, to sit, as an expression of being bowed down, struck down and forsaken, with לֹא־רָצָן, Is. iii. 26; Job ii. 13; עַל־עֵפֶר, Is. xlvii. 1; בָּרָדָר, Lam. i. 1; iii. 28; מְשֻׁמֵּם, Ezr. ix. 3; אֶלְמָנָה, Gen. xxxviii. 11; Is. xlvii. 8."] רַבְתִּי. It is probable that the form רַבְתִּי, in the kindred passage, Is. i. 21, influenced the choice of the form of the word here.—בְּאַלְמָנָה, as a widow. In antithesis to רַבְתִּי עַם, full of people, שְׁבוּיָה, bereaved of children, childless, would be first suggested: but this word occurs only once, Is. xlix. 21. שְׁבוּיָה, also, occurs once only (in connection with אֶלְמָנָה, Jer. xlviii. 21. עֵקֶרָה is the barren woman, מְשַׁבֵּלָה or מְשַׁבֵּלָה is abortum faciens, Ex. xxiii. 26; 2 Kings ii. 19, 21, or infanticida, Ez. xxxvi. 13. אֶלְמָנָה suits admirably, in that it involves the impossibility of bearing children in the future. And that is what the Poet would say. Jerusalem is placed in a condition in which it is impossible for her to become a mother of children, Ps. cxiii. 9. The other feature, that she is also a widow robbed of the children already born to her, is further brought out in what follows. I do not believe, therefore, that Jerusalem is here called a widow, because she is bereaved "of king and princes, and the protection and guidance of rulers," as VITTINGA and others after him (lately ENGELHARDT), appealing to Is. xlvii. 8, have been inclined to think. Besides that, בְּאַלְמָנָה is not synonymous with לֹא־רָצָן, Raschir has already remarked. Compare לֹכֵם at the close of this verse, and לֹוֹנָה, Is. i. 21. The word אֶלְמָנָה is often found in Jeremiah, vii. 6;

xv. 8; xviii. 21; xxii. 3. [HENDERSON is too positive when he says, "The **בְּאֵלְמֶנָּה** is simply that of comparison, and is not intended to express any hope that she would be restored from her widowed state, as JARCHI fancifully supposes." Comparison is not assertion; a thing is not what it is compared with. If **בְּ** then does simply indicate a comparison, yet it leaves a possibility, and hence a hope of restoration from a widowed state; and there is certainly more than a 'fanciful' distinction between *being* a widow, **לְאֵלְמֶנָּה**, and *being like one*, **בְּאֵלְמֶנָּה**.—W. H. H.]

—**הָיְתָה לְכֶם**, *has become tributary*. The expression is found in Genesis (xlix. 15) and in Deuteronomy (xx. 11); and is especially frequent in 1 Kings (v. 27, 28; ix. 15, 21) and in Judges (i. 28, 30, 33, 35). It is also found in Isaiah (xxxi. 8). The etymology and fundamental meaning are not quite certain. At all the places cited the word indicates bond-service, or rather, collectively, *services* (see **מִסַּע עֲבָדָה**, Gen. xlix. 15; Josh. xvi. 10; 1 Kings ix. 21). It first occurs in the sense of *tributum*, a money tax, very late, Esth. x. 1. It is, however, unimportant whether we take the word in our text in the one sense or the other. Nor can we from this word determine the exact period of time, as J. D. MICHAELIS would do, when he says: "Therefore she is still standing, but has become tributary. This first happened under the Egyptians" (he has here in mind evidently 2 Kings xxiii. 33). "To what time then is this to be referred,—to that of the elegy on Josiah, or to that of a later period?" If Jerusalem was no longer standing, and not a human soul dwelt there, yet the place on which the ruins of Jerusalem remained had become, with the whole land, a part of the territory subjected to the Chaldeans.

Ver. 2. **She weepeth sore in the night.**—*She weeps and weeps the night throughout*. [This translation is beautiful and expository, but for grammatical reasons the E. V. is to be preferred. See the *Gramm. Notes*.—W. H. H.] The sorrowing widow weeps in the night. Not in the night-time only, in distinction from day-time,—nor, as EWALD prefers, 'until the night.' For why should she not weep during the night also? Precisely this is the meaning of the poet. She weeps in the night, but not only a part of the night, for

that were nothing wonderful, but so that her weeping fills up the time which is usually spent otherwise. So is **בְּלֵילָהּ** to be understood in Num. xiv. 1, "and the people wept that night." See Jer. vi. 5; xxxvi. 30, *et al.* [HENDERSON: "To express the more aggravated character of the weeping, it is represented as indulged in even during the night—the period of rest and quiet."]—**And her tears are on her cheeks.** 'Tears,' Jer. viii. 23; ix. 17, *et al.* The absence of a predicate index, which renders the supplement of the copula '*are*' necessary, gives the idea evidently that the tears on her cheeks are constantly there, have fixed *there*, as it were, their permanent place. [HENRY: "Nothing dries away sooner than a tear, yet fresh griefs extort fresh tears, so that her cheeks are never free from them."]—**Among all her lovers she hath none to comfort her.**—*She has no comforter*.—[That this phrase has an important meaning is to be inferred by its recurrence four times in this chapter (vers. ii. 9; xvii. 21; see also ver. 16), and from its being an unusual form, occurring elsewhere only in Eccl. iv. 1. It can have no common-place meaning. It refers indirectly to the loss of the Comforter—*their God*.—W. H. H.]—**All her friends have dealt treacherously with her, they are become her enemies.** The words *lovers* and *friends* indicate the human supports on which Jerusalem foolishly and presumptuously believed she could rely, especially all those nations whose friendship she had so often preferred, instead of trusting in Jehovah. See ver. 19; Jer. ii. 13, 18, 33, 36, 37; xxii. 20, 22; Hos. ii. 7 sqq.; Ezek. xxiii. These places show, in harmony with history, that the nations toward which Israel felt itself drawn in amorous love, but by which at last they were not only deserted, but treated with even positive hostility, were especially Assyria, Babylon and Egypt. With reference to Egypt, see particularly Ezek. xxix. 6, 7, 16. See EWALD *in loc.* [HENDERSON: "The *lovers* and *friends* were those neighboring states which were allies of the Hebrews,—and their idol-gods, which they worshipped, and in which they trusted. Egypt especially was the object of their confidence, but not even she durst venture to come to their help against the Chaldeans. Those in the more immediate vicinity actually joined the northern enemy on his irruption into the country. 2 Kings xxiv. 2."]

I. 3.

- 3 Judah is gone into captivity, because of affliction, and because of great servitude; she dwelleth among the heathen, she findeth no rest: all her persecutors overtook her between the straits.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 3.—**נִלְתָּה**, see Jer. i. 3.—**עֲנִי**, found in Lam. i. 3, 7, 9; iii. 1, 19, does not occur in Jeremiah; yet Isaiah uses it xlviii. 10; occurs also in Pentateuch; Gen. xvi. 11; xxxix. 32; xxxi. 42; Ex. iii. 7; Deut. xvi. 3; xxvi. 7, *etc.*; in Psalms ix. 14; xxv. 18; xxxi. 8, and in other writings of earlier origin than Lam.—**כָּרַב** is found in Is. vii. 22; xxiv. 22; Nah. iii. 4, *et al.*; Jeremiah says **אֶלְרָב**, xxx. 14, 15, or **פָּרַב**, xlii. 22.—**יִנְכָּרָה** does not occur in Jeremiah, yet frequently in Penta-

teuch, and in Is. xiv. 3; xxxii. 17; xxviii. 21.—כָּנָה occurs Gen. viii. 9; Deut. xxviii. 65; Is. xxxiv. 14, is not used by Jeremiah; he uses כְּנִיחָה, xlv. 3. [See *Intr. Add. R.* (4), p. 30. (6), p. 31.]—נָצַץ occurs in Jer. xlii. 16 (see also xxxix. 5; lii. 8).]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3. The tribe of Judah is the subject here, as the city of Jerusalem was in vers. 1, 2, and is conceived of similarly as an ideal person.—**Judah is gone into captivity, because of affliction and because of great servitude.** *Into exile is Judah gone from oppression and severe servitude.* It has been correctly remarked that *from oppression and from hard servitude* cannot refer to the involuntary exile of Judah, since it is added *she findeth no rest*. For who may expect rest for a people carried into captivity? But voluntary fugitives might hope to find rest. Of such voluntary exiles, Jeremiah speaks in xl. 11, 12, and from Jer. xlii. 4-7 we learn that all these finally agreed together to seek rest in Egypt. That they *found no rest* there exactly agrees with what the prophet had declared, xlii. 13-22, to the people stubbornly persisting in the flight to Egypt. When the Poet speaks here of Judah as a fugitive, seeking rest and finding none, the reason for his doing so may be surmised from the fact that he himself belonged to that part of the people that were living in exile. We may suppose, also, that he regarded this part of the nation as a representative of the whole nation, because they consisted of people who were at least free. It is much like saying,—Judah is no longer with those who have become mixed with a foreign people as slaves. If it yet survive, it survives in a voluntary exile, where, notwithstanding its distressed state and reduced numbers, it still retains at least its personal liberty. [BLAYNEY: "Our translators, who have rendered, **Judah is gone into captivity because of affliction and because of great servitude**, seem to have adopted the notion of the Chaldee Paraphrast, who represents the Jews to have been carried into captivity in retaliation of their having oppressed the widow and the fatherless among them, and prolonged illegally the bondage of their brethren who had been sold them for slaves." HENDERSON adopts this view, that Judah is here represented as suffering captivity on account of, or *because of* her oppressing and cruelly enslaving her own people, see Jer. xxxiv. But the other view, that Judah sought by voluntary exile to escape the oppression and enslavement of the Chaldeans, is recommended by the reasons given above, and is adopted by BLAYNEY,

C. B. and J. D. MICHAELIS, BOOTHROYD and NOYES. HOUBIGANT, quoted approvingly by BOOTHROYD in his *Heb. Bib.*, connects the words "from oppression and hard servitude" with the words "she findeth no rest," an obvious and awkward attempt to escape the difficulty of the supposed causal sense of כָּנָה. HUGH BROUGHTON translates *Judah leaveth country after affliction and much bondage.*—W. H. H.]—[**She dwelleth among the heathen**, lit., *nations, i. e., the heathen nations.* The word *dwelt* conveys an idea of a settled permanent abode, not required by the Hebrew, יָשָׁבָה. The German, *sißet*, which NÄGELSBACH uses, is better (see ver. 1). The fugitive, fleeing before her pursuers, finds at last a place among the heathen, where she sits down in hoped-for security; but in vain; *her pursuers overtake her*, as the hart is found by the hunter, in the straits or defiles of the mountain, from which there is no escape. See ver. 6, *they flee like harts before the pursuer.*—W. H. H.]—**She findeth no rest: all her persecutors, pursuers**, in antithesis to *all her lovers and all her friends* in ver. 2 (see i. 6; iv. 19; Jer. xv. 15; xvii. 18; xx. 11) **overtook her between the straits.** מִצָּרִים (Sing. מִצָּר) occurs, besides here, only Ps. cxvi. 3; cxviii. 5. It can mean neither ἀλβοντες (so Sept., which erroneously takes it for a participle), nor *termini*, ὁρισμοί (so Chald., Venitian Greek, *et al.*). It means *angustiae*, narrow defiles from which there is no outlet. The figure is taken from the chase. See the German phrase, "*in die Engen treiben*," "to drive one into straits." [W. ROBERTSON: "מִצָּר, a streight, or a streighting distress." FUERST: "to take one in the straits, *i. e.*, to get one at last into our power, a proverbial phrase." The present use of the English word *straits* (as 'reduced to straits,' 'in great straits') explains the sense here, but does not justify the translation, *overtook her between the straits.*—W. H. H.] The fugitive Judah sits indeed in the midst of a heathenish people, but has found there no rest. She would flee still further, were it possible. But whither could the Jews, with their wives, their children, and all their goods, have fled beyond the desert-surrounded Egypt? They dwelt there, it is true, but they dwelt *amidst straits*. All their pursuers (and that there were enough of them in Egypt, old and new, is evident from Jer. xlii. 12, 18, 26 sqq.) could reach them there.

I. 4-6.

- 4 The ways of Zion do mourn, because none come to the solemn feasts: all her gates are desolate; her priests sigh, her virgins are afflicted, and she is in bitterness.
- 5 Her adversaries are the chief, her enemies prosper; for the LORD hath afflicted her for the multitude of her transgressions: her children are gone into captivity before the enemy.
- 6 And from the daughter of Zion all her beauty is departed: her princes are become like harts that find no pasture; and they are gone without strength before the pursuer.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 4.—**אֲבֵל**, adj. *mournful* [not *desert, waste, devastated*, as FUEST says, which destroys the beautiful personification—W. H. H.], occurs Gen. xxxvii. 35; Is. lvii. 18, *et al.*, never in Jeremiah. The verb **אָבַל** he uses, in the same sense as the adjective here (iv. 28; xii. 4, 11; xiv. 2; xxxii. 10) [and also the noun **אֲבֵל**, vi. 26, *et al.*—W. H. H.] Isaiah uses the adjective, lvii. 18; lxi. 23.—**מִבְּלִי**, see Jer. ii. 15; ix. 10, 11.—The expression **כָּאֵל** (see Gen. xxiii. 10, 18) is not found in Jeremiah.—**כְּזִמְרָה** is found in Jeremiah twice, viii. 7; xli. 17, both times in the sense of *tempus festum*. In the Lamentations the word occurs six times, and always in the sense of *a time of feast, a festival*, i. 4, 15; ii. 6, 7, 22, or *the place of a feast*, ii. 6. [It may have here the sense of *an appointed time*. Ordinary services in the Temple are neglected. None flock to Zion at the usual times of service.—W. H. H.]—The part **שְׂוִיָּם** is not in Jeremiah: he uses the part *Niph.*, xxxiii. 10, and **שְׂוִיָּם**, xii. 11. The plur. ending **־יָ** (see iv. 3, K'tib), is not found in Jeremiah.—The root **אָנַח** Jeremiah does not use, either in a verbal or a substantive form (see Lam. i. 8, 11, 21).—**נִגְנוֹת**, see **הוֹנָה** below.—**כָּר** Jeremiah does use, ii. 19; iv. 18.

Ver. 5.—As shown above, **הִי לְרָאשׁ** is a Deuteronomic, **שָׁלָה** a Jeremic expression. For grammatical form of latter, see OLSH., § 233, b. **הוֹנָה** never occurs in Jeremiah, but frequently in Lamentations, i. 4, 12; iii. 32, 33; elsewhere, Is. ii. 23; Zeph. iii. 18. [Vulgate derives it from **הִנָּה**, which sometimes means *to speak*; *quia Dominus locutus est super eam*; DOUAY, *because the Lord hath spok-n against her*. But SEPT., SYR. and Versions generally derive it from **יָנָה**.—W. H. H.]—**עַל-רֹב** is entirely Jeremic (see on **כָּרַב**, ver. 3).—**פָּשַׁע** in Jeremiah only once, v. 6.—**עֵינֹלֶל**, Jer. xlv. 7; **עֵינֹלֶל**, Jer. vi. 11; ix. 20.—**הַלֵּךְ שְׁבִי** is peculiar to this place. **שְׁבִי** cannot well be an accusative, since to go into exile is always elsewhere expressed by **פָּשַׁע**, **הוֹלֵךְ פָּשַׁע**, see ver. 18. [HENDERSON: *her children are gone captives before the enemy*.]—The sing. **צָר**, which is frequent in Lam. (i. 7, 10; ii. 4; iv. 12), never occurs in Jeremiah: he uses only the plural (xxx. 16; xlv. 10) and **צָרָה** (iv. 31; vi. 24, *et al.*).

Ver. 6.—**כִּן-בֵּית**, for *forsaken, lost*, is peculiar. [HENDERSON: “For **כִּן-בֵּית** the K’ri and some MSS. read more correctly **קִבַּת**. The phrase is also thus quoted in the Rabboth.” This best suits the rhythm.—W. H. H.]—**הָרָר** is never found in Jeremiah; nor **אֵיל** (yet see **אֵילָה**, xiv. 5); nor **כִּרְעָה** (Jeremiah always says **כִּרְעִית**, x. 21: xxxii. 1; xxv. 36). We find expressions in Jeremiah analogous to **כֵּת פְּלֵא יוֹעִיל**, ii. 11, **פְּלֵא יוֹעִיל**, v. 7, **פְּלֵא אֱלֹהִים**, v. 7, **רֹר-פְּלֵא אֱלֹהִים** is found in Jeremiah, but only with suffixes, xv. 15; xvii. 18; xx. 11.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

These verses contain a description of the present condition of the city and people of Jerusalem [or, a new aspect of their condition is presented.—We have here another of those changes which impart to these poems a highly dramatic character. A third personage is introduced,—“the daughter of Zion.” The ideal person here is not that of the *city* of Jerusalem, formerly in outward splendor and estate a queen among the nations, now fallen and humbled (vers. 1, 2), nor yet that of the *tribe* of Judah, or of the *theocratic people*, now a fugitive among the heathen (ver. 3),—but of Zion, formerly the seat of the theocracy, the abode of God, the Temple where Judah and Jerusalem worshipped, now forsaken and despoiled. No longer do the people gather to her appointed solemnities. Silence reigns on Zion, broken only by the sobs of her priests and the moaning of her virgins, a higher evidence than either the ruined city or the exiled people, that the glory was departed from Israel.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 4. **The ways of Zion, The way to Zion**, those ways which lead to Zion: not the streets of the city, as ROSENUELLER thinks, for the latter are called **חֲזִינֹת** (see Hos. vii. 1 with vi. 9), **do mourn, are mournful** (Protopopœia, as, e.g., ii. 19; Jer. xiv. 2; xxxiii. 10; Am. i. 2), **because none come to the solemn feasts, forsaken by those who used to come to her feasts** [because there are none coming to her appointed services. Appointed assemblies, including all occasions of stated worship, whether daily sacrifices or annual festivals, would more correctly interpret the sense than

either “feasts,” “solemn feasts,” or “festivals.”—W. H. H.]—**All her gates are desolate, destroyed**. Concerning the city itself, its gates are destroyed. But ruined gates are the sign of a ruined city. [“Destroyed,” so NAEGELSACH, *zerstört*, Sept. ἡ ἀναστροφή=razed to the ground, Vulg. *destructæ*. E. V. and modern Versions generally read *desolate*. It is the gates of Zion, not the gates of the city of Jerusalem, that are here referred to. Those sacred barriers are removed. The holy place has lost its sanctity. It is open now to the intrusion of any who please to enter. See ver. 10: “*She hath seen that the heathen entered into her sanctuary whom Thou didst command that they should not enter into Thy congregation*.” What could more forcibly express, in accordance with Jewish ideas, the idea that the theocratic glory had departed from Israel?—W. H. H.]—**Her priests sigh: her virgins are afflicted, sorrowful**. Two classes of the inhabitants are named.—the priests and the virgins: the former the nobility, the latter the flower and ornament of the nation. The former sigh under heavy oppression; the latter, who formerly rendered every festival attractive, with dances and pastimes (see Jer. xxxi. 13; HERZ. *Real. Encyc.*, XV., pp. 414, 415), are now sorrowful. It is thus intimated that every possibility of making a joyous festival is gone. See Jer. vii. 34; xvi. 9; xxv. 10; xxxiii. 11; comp. xxx. 19. The Sept. reads, instead of *sorrowful*, ἀγένηται=led away; the translation evidently of נִדְּחֹת, which either really stood in the text, or was erroneously substituted by the Alexandrian for the rare word נִגְנוֹת. EWALD follows the Sept. Incorrectly, it seems to me. נִגְנוֹת is sufficiently expressive, if it be taken as an indication of the prevailing grief

and in antithesis to the indications of the public rejoicings that existed in former times. [The mention of "the priests" particularly shows that the sacred precincts of Zion, where they ministered, and where "the virgins" went up to the solemn feasts with joy and gladness, are before the Poet's eye. To say that *the priests* are mentioned because they constituted "the nobility" of the inhabitants of the city, is not only awkward, but untrue. NOYES translates the last clause *Her virgins wail*: a meaning of the original word not licensed by authority.—W. H. H.]—**And she is in bitterness.** In these words the whole is summed up. [It is, perhaps, impossible to give in English the exquisite force of the original. NAEGELSBACH nearly reproduces it in German, "*Und ihr—ist wehe.*"—W. H. H.] Here it is evident that the ideal person of Zion is the embodiment of all the particular members and ranks of the community (*des volkslebens*). [If this were indisputably evident, it would not militate with the fact that Zion represented the religious life as Judah did the political life of the people.—W. H. H.]—This relative conclusion shows that the Poet proposes to pass to something new. In fact, ver. 4 describes the positive sorrows and afflictions of the people: ver. 5, *a. b.*, the good fortune of her enemies as the natural reciprocal effect of the misfortunes of Judah; vers. 5, *c.*, 6, the negative side of the painful experience of the people, namely, the losses they sustained.

Ver. 5. **Her adversaries are the chief,** lit., *have become the head* [*i. e., her superiors.* BLAYNEY and NOYES: or, *the head over her.* BOOTHROYD.] In Deut. xxviii. 13 a promise is made to Israel, if obedient, "and the Lord shall make thee the head and not the tail," and in same chapter, ver. 44, the reverse is threatened, if disobedient. The Poet, without doubt, had these passages in his mind.—**Her enemies prosper.** The darkness of Israel's sorrows is deepened by the brilliant prosperity of her enemies. The expression occurs in same sense, Jer. xii. 1. See Ps. cxxii. 6; Job xii. 6.—**For the LORD hath afflicted her for the multitude of her transgressions.** This advantage on the part of their enemies had not happened by chance, nor by mere arbitrariness or unrighteousness on the side of God, but by an act of Divine rectitude in the punishment of Israel for their sins. What is professedly made conspicuous in ver. 8 is here anticipated. [Observe, in connection with Zion, as the representative of the religious element of the theocratic idea, in distinction from the national, the name Jehovah is first introduced, and the calamities suffered by the people are first distinctly ascribed to their sins;—the sins especially of priests and ministers of religion, and of hypocrisy, formalism and idolatry on the part of the people.—W. H. H.]—**Her children are gone into captivity,** *her young children are gone captives.* From here to end of ver. 6 the Poet describes what Judah has lost. And first, *her children.* עֲוֹלָלִים are little children (see ii. 20; iv. 4; Jer. vi. 11; ix. 20). These are compelled *as captives* to go forth before the oppressor into foreign lands. See Joel iv. 2, 3.—**Before the enemy.** [The word *ad-*

versary (so BROUGHTON) is preferred to *enemy*, E. V., because the word in Hebrew is the same as that rendered "adversaries" in the first clause. *Oppressor* and *oppressors* might be well substituted.—W. H. H.] What renders this more dreadful is the idea that the little children are torn away from parents and brothers and sisters, to be driven as merchandise by their purchasers, some to one place and some to another. [HENDERSON: "In the representations which we find on ancient sculptures nothing is more affecting than to observe females and young children driven as captives before their conquerors." Observe, *young children* are mentioned in connection with Zion because they, in a peculiar sense, are the care of the church, of the religious rather than the political rulers, the lambs of the flock entrusted to the spiritual shepherds of Israel. Nothing could more forcibly express, in accordance with Jewish ideas, the fact that God had forsaken His people, than that the heathen were suffered, without Divine hindrance, to carry away these *young children*, the children of the covenant, into captivity and slavery. It is this thought that constitutes the poetic climax, showing how severely Jehovah afflicted Zion for her sins.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 6. **And from the daughter of Zion all her beauty is departed.** Zion has lost, not only her dearest and most precious ones, her children, but also her *beauty*, her glory. This last feature is represented by the *princes*, with whom, and before them all, the king is to be classed. [What then was the *beauty* of Zion—the King and the Princes, or God Himself? The *beauty* of Zion was the presence of Jehovah and the maintenance of His worship on the Holy Mount. See Lam. ii. 1, 6; 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22; Ezek. vii. 20-22; Ps. 1. 2, "Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined," Ps. xvi. 9, "Oh, worship the Lord

in the beauty of holiness," בְּהַרְרֵת קִדְשׁ, Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14. The *beauty* of Zion departed when God forsook His people, suffered the Temple to be destroyed, Jer. liii. 13, and the ordinances of worship to be discontinued. The condition of her *princes*, like hunted harts, pursued and overtaken, is the consequence of the destruction of Zion, whence they are driven forth, deprived of all spiritual nourishment. God is no longer with them. No more are they fed with the bread of Heaven; and therefore, like starved and parched harts, they fall an easy prey to their pursuers.—W. H. H.]—**Her princes are become like harts that find no pasture; and they are gone without strength before the enemy.** These noble and fleet-footed animals lose, by hunger, their strength and the power of flight. They are caught and driven at pleasure. So the princes of Zion, formerly her pride and strength, are driven forth by the pursuer. The Sept. and JEROME have κριοί, *arietes*, =rams. They read or understood אֵילִים. But evidently אֵיל is the stag or hart (see Deut. xii. 15; xiv. 5; xv. 22): rams would not suit in this connection, since rams do not belong to those animals of the chase, which only suffer themselves to be taken by men, when hunger deprives them of power to escape.

I. 7.

- 7 Jerusalem remembered in the days of her affliction, and of her miseries, all her pleasant things that she had in the days of old, when her people fell into the hand of the enemy, and none did help her: the adversaries saw her, and did mock at her sabbaths.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 7.—**יָמֵי עֲנִיָּהּ** is not the object of **זָכְרָה**, but indicates the time, as is evident from the absence of **י** before **כָּל**. The accusative **יָמֵי** answers, as frequently, the question, *When?* See my *Gr.*, §70, d. [BLAYNEY: "Houbigant supposes that we ought to read **יָמֵי** for **יָמֵי**; but I am inclined to think that it is not the **י**, but the **כָּ**, which has been sunk before **יָמֵי**, by means of the preceding word having been terminated with the same letter,—a mistake of which we find numberless instances originating from the same cause. **יָמֵי** signifies *during the days*, or *since they began*, as **יָמֵי קָדֶם** does presently after, *in or during former days*." BOOTHROYD quotes this note with approval in his Hebrew Bible. HENDERSON says, "in **יָמֵי** there is an ellipsis of **בְּ**, of which there are numerous examples." But nouns may be "used absolutely to express the relations of time," see GREEN'S *Gr.*, §274, 2.—W. H. H.].—**כִּרְדִּים**, not from **כָּרַד**, but from **רָדַד**, *dissipari*, *vagari* (Hos. xii. 1; Jer. ii. 31), is *vagatio*, *erratio*, *vila extorris et erratici* (FIERST). The word is found, besides here and iii. 19, only at Is. lviii. 7. [Dr J. A. ALEXANDER translates **כִּרְדִּים** **וְעֲנִיָּה** *the afflicted, the homeless*, and remarks, "LOWTH'S version—the wandering poor—is now commonly regarded as substantially correct. **כִּרְדִּים** is properly an abstract, meaning *wandering* (from **רָדַד**), here used for the concrete *wanderers*." Accepting the opinion of LOWTH and ALEXANDER, I have put "*wanderings*" in the text. FIERST, in his concordance, derives the word from **רָדַד**, as above, but, in his Lexicon, from **כָּרַד**, and translates it *expulsion, persecution, misery*. W. ROBERTSON says, "**כִּרְדִּיהָ**, her *wanderings*, her lamentations, her miseries or calamities, or her rebellions, for the word may be referred to the root **רָדַד**, in Hiph., to *mourn*, to *lament*; or to the root **כָּרַד**, to *rebel*." BLAYNEY says it "comes from **רָדַד**, to *descend* from a higher to a lower condition," and so translates it *abatement*. The variety of meanings put upon the word is indicated in the following English Versions: BROUGHTON, *zealings*; BLAYNEY, *abusement*; BOOTHROYD, *misery*; HENDERSON, *persecution*; NOYES, *oppression*. But *wanderings* is evidently best supported by its use and most natural derivation, and suits the meaning here, but in iii. 19 it seems to denote simply a condition of wretchedness.—W. H. H.].—**כְּחֹמֶר** **בְּחֹמֶר**, only here and ver. 11, K'tib. Neither **כְּחֹמֶר**, found in Jeremiah. He uses only **חֹמֶר** (iii. 19; xii. 10; xxv. 34).—**יָמֵי קָדֶם**, in Jeremiah we have **יָמֵי קָדֶם**, xlv. 26.—**בְּיַד בִּי** could be *into the hand* [E. V., BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, NOYES] instead of *by* [BROUGHTON]; the difference is not important.—[BLAYNEY: "Instead of **רָאוּ הָעַיִן** I propose to read **רָאוּ הָעַיִן**." An ingenious, but unnecessary, unauthorized change.—W. H. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 7. **Jerusalem**. [Here occurs another of those sudden changes which give to this poem its highly dramatic character. In the preceding verses, which may be properly regarded as introductory to all that follows, the *city*, the *nation*, and the *church* have been successively introduced. Now *Jerusalem* is named for the first time. *Jerusalem*, here, must be regarded as generic and comprehensive; the representative of the theocratic idea; the head of all the cities of Israel, the type of its nationality, the seat of its worship, where God dwelt in its consecrated Zion. The ideal persons who have already appeared,—the ruined city, pictured as a sorrowing widow and dethroned and conquered queen, of vers. 1, 2,—the exile, fleeing from misery and bondage, seeking a home among heathen, but finding no rest, no escape from trouble and persecution, of ver. 3,—the *daughter of Zion*, despoiled of her beauty, bewailing the absence of worshippers, the invasion of her sacred courts by heathen, the captivity of her infant children and the humiliation of her proud leaders and princes, of vers. 4-6,—all now are embraced under the generic name of *JERUSALEM*, which from this verse to the end of the chapter is personified as the representative of the theocratic idea.—W. H. H.].—**remembered**, *remembers*. The unfortunate cannot forbear recalling their former prosperity, the remembrance of which serves both to com-

fort them and to increase their sorrow. Zion follows this propensity of nature.—**in the days of her affliction and of her miseries, all her pleasant things**.—All the glorious things, of a spiritual and of a temporal nature, which had fallen to the lot of the chosen people from the beginning of their history, are now the subject of painful remembrance.—**that she had in the days of old**. See ii. 17; Is. xxiii. 7; xxxvii. 26; Mich. vii. 20. [BROUGHTON: "in the old time." HENDERSON: "from ancient days."] EWALD regards the words, *all the pleasant things she had from the days of old*, as erroneously transplanted here out of ver. 10. His principal reason seems to be that they spoil the rhythm. VAHINGER supposes that this verse, as well as ii. 19, contains four members. I see no necessity for this. We are only to regard the two members of the first part of the verse as of greater length. There is apparently no exact measure for the number of syllables of the several members. The thought that Jerusalem in her misery remembers her *present* misery [which would be the sense according to EWALD's emendation] is unnatural; for **זָכַר** [to *call to mind*, to *remember*] always suggests something distant, remote, in reference to space or time, and, in the latter relation, either past or future. Besides, the words, "that she had in the days of old," so appropriate in ver. 7, would be altogether superfluous and confusing in ver. 10.—**when her people fell into the hand of the enemy, when her people fall by the hand of the oppressor**

This is a more particular description of "the days of her affliction." They were the days when her people fell by the hand of their enemies.—and none did help her, and she has no helper. [So all the Eng. Versions, except E. V.]—the adversaries saw her, her oppressors behold her. The construction is determined by what precedes, according to acknowledged usage. See my *Gr.*, § 99.—[לֹא]—*to see*, has here the sense of *looking at* in the way of inspection, *beholding* (BROUGHTON), perhaps in the sense of 'looking at a person with satisfaction or joy,' to 'feast the eyes upon one with malicious joy' (see FUERST'S *Lex.*). The remark of Dr. J. A. ALEXANDER on Is. liii. 2, that לֹא "means to view with pleasure only when followed by the preposition ב," needs qualification.—W. H. H.]—and did mock—they mock—at her Sabbaths. מְשַׁבֵּחַ is an *ἀπ. λεγ.* The sense of the word itself is clear. It can only mean *cessationes, excidia* [cessations, destructions]. But the choice of a word else unused, seems to indicate that the scorn of their enemies was of an *equivocal* character; namely, they scoffed not only because Zion had come to its end, but likewise because now a general Sabbath, a day of rest for the land in a bad sense, had begun. We have then a proof that the Sabbath was to the heathen, even before the days of Rome (see *Juv. Sat.* XIV. 96-106; *Pers.* V. 179-184; *Mart.* IV. 4, 7), an occasion for mockery. [HUGH BROUGHTON: "This prophesieth how in Babel they will mourn for desire unto their feasts, which in their Land they would not keep aright. And the Chaldeans will scoff at their Sabbatisms, as did long after HORACE, OVID, and other Poets,—and TULLY, too, deserving to have his head cut off and his tongue pricked, as he had. The Ps. cxxxvii. commenteth upon this verse."] This early mockery of the Jewish Sabbath would be more likely to happen, since it would naturally come to the ears of those who destroyed Jerusalem, that the commandment itself predicted to the disobedient people a time of desolation, as an involuntary Sabbath rest of the land. See Lev. xxvi. 34, 43; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. I believe, therefore, that the old explanation of Vulg., Arab., LUTHER, L. CAPELLE, translating מְשַׁבֵּחַ

by *Sabbaths*, is right, so far as it allows an *equivocal* sense of this word. [This word has given the translators and commentators much trouble. The Sept. translates it by μετακεία, "and mocked at her captivity," deriving the noun from שָׁבַח, *captivum ducere*. The other Versions vary. BLAYNEY: "*discontinuance*;" "HOURBIGNANT justly observes that שָׁבַח is nowhere used for *Sabbath*, etc. But without taking the liberty which he does of substituting another word, כְּשִׁבְרָה, the use of the verb שָׁבַח will justify giving to כְּשִׁבְרָה a sense well suited to the exigence of the passage, namely, 'her discontinuance,' that is, the ceasing, or causing to cease, of her, or of her former prosperity." BOOTHROYD and NOYES: "*destruction*." HENDERSON: "they laughed at her ruin," כְּשִׁבְרָהּ, lit., *her ruined circumstances*; the state of the complete cessation of all the active businesses of life. Root, שָׁבַח *to cease*; Hiph., *to put an end to, cause to cease*." BROUGHTON: "*Sabbatisms*;" (which, as preserving the equivocal sense, is to be preferred).—BLAYNEY: "Some critics have been willing to discard this line, *Her oppressors behold her—they mock at her Sabbaths*—as well as the fourth in ii. 19, but for no better reason than because all the other periods in the two chapters consist of three lines only. But I think this not a sufficient ground, in opposition to the authority of all the Hebrew copies and ancient Versions." HENDERSON, who makes four lines of this verse, and only three of the others, remarks, "there is no reason to believe that Jeremiah considered himself so rigidly bound to adhere to his triple arrangement, as on no occasion to break through it in order to give utterance to a thought forcibly bearing on the statement which he had just made." Why then adopt an artificial style at all? But there is no necessity for making four members instead of three of this verse. Each member consists of two distinctly marked clauses; and in this verse the first member has two clauses of more than usual length. NÆGELSBACH'S arrangement of the lines in sixes, instead of triplets, plainly disposes of this difficulty, and its correctness is vindicated by the accents.—W. H. H.]

I. 8-11.

- 8 Jerusalem hath grievously sinned; therefore she is removed: all that honored her, despise her, because they have seen her nakedness; yea, she sigheth, and
9 turneth backward. Her filthiness is in her skirts; she remembereth not her last end; therefore she came down wonderfully: she had no comfort. O LORD, be
10 hold my afflictions; for the enemy hath magnified himself. The adversary hath spread out his hand upon all her pleasant things: for she hath seen that the heathen entered into her sanctuary, whom thou didst command that they should not enter
11 into thy congregation. All her people sigh, they seek bread: they have given their pleasant things for meat to relieve the soul: see, O LORD, and consider; for I am become vile.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 8.—חַטָּא חַטָּא. See my *Gr.*, § 93, *d*, note. The form חַטָּא (frequent in Deuteronomy, xv. 9; xxi. 22, etc., comp. Is. xxxi. 7; liii. 12; Hos. xii. 9) is never found in Jeremiah, and in Lam. only here and iii. 39. Jeremiah uses only the form חַטָּאת, xvi. 10, 18; xvii. 1, 3; xviii. 23, *et al.* The verb חַטָּא is frequent with him, ii. 35; iii. 25; viii. 14.—

[BLAYNEY: "For לַנִּירָה, which occurs nowhere else, nineteen MSS., and the first edition of the *Hagiographa*, read לַנִּירָה, as at ver. 17 and various other places."—כִּכְבֹּר, not found in Jeremiah; 1 Sam. ii. 30; 2 Sam. x. 3; Prov. xiv. 31.—

The Hiphil form, הִזִּיר (not to be confounded with הִזִּיר from הִזָּן, Is. xlviii. 21), occurs only here. See OLSH., § 255, *h*, note. In Jer. xv. 19 we find וּלְלָ, *abjectum, vile*. [The word is from חָלַל, Chaldaic inflexion. See BENJAMIN DAVIDSON,

Analyt. Lex., § 18, 14; or from חָלַל, see FUERST, *Lex.*—W. H. H.]—עֲרִירָה, not found in Jeremiah. See Is. xlvii. 3; Ezek. xvi. 37. [CRANMER, BISHOPS' B., *filthiness*; BROUGHTON, BOOTHROYD, NOYES, *shame*.]—אָהֹר is found in Jeremiah only with הָלַךְ, xv. 6, and נָסֹג, xxxviii. 22; xli. 5.

Ver. 9.—טַמְאָתָהּ. EWALD, wholly unnecessarily, would read טַמְאָתָהּ, *she polluted* (§ 194, *b*). The word is not found

in Jeremiah.—פְּלִאִים, acc. adverbial. See נִפְלְאוֹת, Job xxxvii. 5; נִרְאוֹת, Ps. lxxv. 6; מִישָׁרִים, Ps. lxxv. 3; my *Gr.*, § 70, *k*.—הִנְדִּיל requires neither נִפְשֵׁוֹ nor פִּיּוֹ to complete the sense. The object lies in the verb itself. The direct causative is needed (see my *Gr.*, § 18, 3). It also means, to *play the part of* or to *affect greatness*; see Jer. xlviii. 26, 42; comp. 1 Sam. xl. 41. [FUERST gives this verb an *inchoative* sense, to *grow violent*. This sense of the word seems to have induced the inaccurate translation of BLAYNEY, *Behold how an enemy hath aggravated mine affliction*. BOOTHROYD gives same sense.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 10.—פֶּרֶשׁ (see vers. 13, 17; iv. 4) is not strange to the vocabulary of Jeremiah: iv. 31; xvi. 7; xlviii. 40; xlix. 22.—Before כָּאֵן supply אֲשֶׁר.—[HENDERSON: "The ה in צִיְתָהּ is merely the fuller form of the pronominal fragment for צִיְתָה, the common form. It is omitted in some MSS."]

Ver. 11.—כִּחְמוּרֵיהֶם, see vers. 7, 10. [HENDERSON: the form is "quite irregular. It is corrected in the K'ri, which rejects the י. The word is thus exhibited in a great number of MSS. and in eight printed editions."—בָּאֵכֶל. בָּ indicates something given in the way of price or wages; see Gen. xxix. 18; xxx. 26; Is. vii. 23; my *Gr.*, § 112, 5, *a*. אָכַל is not found in Jeremiah. He says אָכַלָה, xii. 19; or מָאֵכַל, vii. 33; xvi. 4; xix. 7; xxxiv. 20.—נִפְשֵׁוֹ occurs vers. 16, 19; Ruth iv. 15; Ps. xix. 8; Prov. xxv. 13, never in Jeremiah.—רָאָה וְהִפְיָטָה. These two imperatives are found together, only in the reverse order, in Job xxxv. 5; Is. lxiii. 15; Ps. lxxx. 15; cxlii. 5. In the Lamentations we also have וְרָאָה וְהִפְיָטָה, ver. 12; וְרָאָה הִפְיָטָה, ver. 1, and וְהִפְיָטָה alone iii. 63. Jeremiah never uses the verb נִבְטָה, which Isaiah uses constantly, v. 12, 30; viii. 22; xviii. 4; xlii. 18; lxiii. 15; xx. 5, 6, *etc.*—וְלִלְלָהּ occurs once in Jer. xv. 19. See הִלְלָהּ, ver. 8. The word is used in a contemptuous sense; Zion [Jerusalem] has become a נִבְוָה (Jer. xxii. 28) when she ought to be

וְלִלְלָהּ (Jer. iii. 19). נִחַלָה is properly the participle of חָלַל, to *shake to and fro*, to *toller*, hence figuratively to be *low*, *bad*, *contemptible*, *abject*, *mean*, and then again figuratively to be *miserable*, *unhappy*, in which last sense it is used here. See FUERST, *Lex.*—W. H. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 8. It is *sin* that has made Jerusalem an object of abhorrence. Her uncleanness has become notorious: therefore those who might comfort her keep far from her, while her heathen oppressors, who, according to the law, should keep away from her, have free access to her.—**Jerusalem hath grievously sinned.** [Lit., *bath sinned a sin*. This Hebraism suggests the idea, not only of a sin of a grievous character, but of sin persevered in, and its guilt aggravated by constant repetition. So CRANMER translates: "Jerusalem hath sinned ever more and more." NAEGLSACH, poetically, if not accurately: *Gesündigt, gesündigt hat Jerusalem*. CALVIN: "Here the Prophet expresses more clearly and strongly what he had briefly referred to, even that all the evils which the Jews suffered proceeded from God's vengeance, and that they were worthy of such a punishment, because they had not lightly offended, but had heaped up for themselves a dreadful judgment, since they had in all manner of ways abandoned themselves to impiety. This is the substance of what is said."—W. H. H.]—**Therefore she is removed.**

[Correctly, therefore she is become vile. WESTMINSTER ANNOTATIONS: "She is become as a woman separated for her uncleanness," Lev. xv. 19; Ezek. xxii. 10; xxxvi. 17; or, *an abominable thing*, for so also is the word used in an abstract notion, Lev. xx. 21; 2 Chron. xxix. 5; Ezra ix. 11. So ver. 17.—W. H. H.]—**All that honoured her despise her.** Those who formerly honored Jerusalem, her friends and allies, now despise her. [CALVIN: "This also did not a little increase the grievousness of her calamity; she had been repudiated by her friends, by whom she had before been valued and honored. The reason is mentioned."—**Because they have seen her nakedness.** By the discovery of her nakedness we are to understand, not merely that after the removal of all protecting covering (*i. e.*, of all means of defence), men could see and even enter into the precincts of her innermost recesses, but especially that in this way the nakedness of Jerusalem, in a moral sense, has become notorious. In reference to her nakedness in this moral sense, Nebuzaradan said (Jer. xl. 3), "because ye have sinned against Jehovah, and have not obeyed His voice, therefore this thing is come upon you." See DELITZSCH on Is. xlvii. 3: "The nakedness of

Babylon is her shameful deeds, which are become manifest as such." The same figure of speech is found in Hos. ii. 10; Nah. iii. 5; Ezek. xiii. 37.—**Yea, she sigheth.** [Yea, she herself, or, as for herself she sigheth, etc.—W. H. H.]—**And turneth backward.** The shame of Jerusalem is so manifest that she herself cannot deny it. There remains nothing for her to do, but groaning to hide herself. See ver. 13; ii. 3; Ps. ix. 4; xlv. 11; lvi. 10. [The sense seems to be that she herself is so self-convicted and stricken with grief and mortification, that she can only sigh and turn her back upon the spectators in the vain endeavor to hide her shame. This would be very natural in the case of a naked woman, and such is the disagreeable image employed by the poet. NAEGELSBACH: *und wendete sich zurück*, lit., and turned herself round. The only other sense that can be put upon the phrase is to regard it as expressive of despair. So CALVIN, "to turn backward means the same as to be deprived of all hope of restoration." But the correctness of such an interpretation is far from obvious. The other is more natural and probable. WEST. ANNOTATIONS: "Yea, she sigheth and turneth backward for shame; as those in such case would do, that have any shamefacedness, or spark of ingenuity at all in them, see Is. xlvii. 5: for they seem to swerve here from the genuine sense, who understand the term *turning back* as intimating a want of power to stand to it, or to rise and recover again, as Jer. xlv. 5."—W. H. H.]

לְנִדָּה, vile. The old translators derive the word from נִדַּר, *vagari, errare*, in the sense of *agitatio, jactatio facta*, i. e., *agitata jactata est*. Others take it in the sense of כָּנַדָּה (Ps. xlv. 15), that at which men shake the head [as an expression of contemptuous pity.—W. H. H.]. But the connection requires that the word be used in the sense of that which excites abhorrence: for, according to the following clause, Jerusalem is despised because men now see her nakedness and her uncleanness. Since the lengthening of a syllable, to compensate for the doubling of the following consonant, is not infrequent [see הַיְלִיָּהּ, next clause, and GREEN'S *Gr.*, § 141, 3.—W. H. H.], we may take נִדָּה as another form of נָדָה (ver. 17). See OLSH., § 82, c. But נָדָה is that which one avoids, flings away from him as vile, abominates, that which is unclean, an object of abhorrence, and then the condition [or state, in the abstract] of uncleanness. It is especially used of the uncleanness of women (Lev. xii. 2; xv. 19, etc.). Here it would denote the person afflicted with such uncleanness, and become, on that account, an object of abhorrence, as Ezek. xviii. 6 speaks of אִשָּׁה נָדָה. Neither נִדָּה nor נָדָה occur in Jeremiah.

[The authorities for the translation of this word are about equally divided. Those that agree with our author are: the Syr., *horror*; Ital., *a laughing-stock*; Ger., *ein unreines Weib*; BLAYNEY, *one set apart for unclean*; HENDERSON, *unclean*; NOYES, *vile*. On the other hand we have: Sept., *fluctuation*; Vulg., *instable*; Targ., *va-*

grant; CRANMER and BISHOPS' *B.*, *therefore she is come in decay*; E. V. and BOOTHROYD, *therefore she is removed*. CALVIN, *therefore she is become a wanderer*; "the word ought properly to be applied to their exile, when the Jews became unfixed and vagrants:" to which his English Editor, Rev. JOHN OWEN, adds this note, "the reference here is evidently to banishment, and not to uncleanness, as some take it, because the noun is sometimes so taken, persons being removed from society on account of uncleanness." HUGH BROUGHTON, *therefore came she into dispersion*, "such uncertainty of place as Cain had, Gen. iv., wandering from place to place." The argument derived from the connection seems to be decisive in favor of the first opinion, *therefore is she become vile, or abominable*, NAEGELSBACH, *zum Abscheu*.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 9. **Her filthiness is in her skirts.**—Zion [Jerusalem] for a long time trifled with sin. She believed the evil she did would not become manifest to her injury. Now it is all become manifest. Her uncleanness has come to the surface: it is no longer hidden within her, but it is on her skirts (see Jer. xiii. 22, 26; Nah. iii. 5). [WORDSWORTH: "It is visible to all; she cannot deny her uncleanness." CALVIN refers this to the punishment, rather than the guilt of their sin; as LOWTH remarks: "she carries the marks of her sins in the greatness of her punishment." The idea of personal uncleanness, however, is stated with such revolting plainness that we cannot fail to see that the very punishment consists in the exposure of her moral pollution. See Jer. ii. 19, 22, 34.—W. H. H.]—**She remembereth not her last end.** She considered not what the end would be. She did not in the beginning reflect what the consequences of her sin must be. [ASSEM. Annot.: "*She remembered not*. She considered not, when time was, what the issue of her wicked courses would be, what they would bring her to at last: see Deut. xxxii. 29. So was it with Babel, Isa. xlvii. 7, and with this people, though forewarned of it, Jer. ii. 25." CALVIN understands this to mean, "that the Jews were so overwhelmed with despair, that they did not raise up their thoughts to God's promises;—they were so demented by their sorrow, that they became stupified, and entertained no hope as to the future." This interpretation grows out of the view that the first clause refers to the punishment of sin and not to sin itself; and is inconsistent with the apparent sense, with the context and with the ordinary use of the phrase "remembering the latter end."—W. H. H.]—**Therefore she came down wonderfully.**—Lit. She considered not her latter end, and came down wonderfully. In consequence of her want of consideration she has fallen and is degraded from her high estate. See Deut. xxviii. 43; Jer. xlviii. 18.—**She had—has—no comforter.** See ver. 2.—**O Lord, behold my affliction, for the enemy hath magnified,—doth magnify—himself.**—A pious ejaculation, which is put in the mouth of Zion [Jerusalem] herself. Jehovah is implored to observe how proudly the enemy, to whom Zion [Jerusalem] is no match, exalts himself. [HENDERSON: "After ascribing the fall of Jerusalem to heedless indulgence in sin, by a striking prosopopeia, he introduces her as im-

ploring the compassionate regard of Jehovah." See, for a strikingly similar rhetorical construction, Gen. xlix. 18.—The idea in the last clause, *for the enemy magnifies himself*, is that the enemy increases his insolence and violence (see *gram. note above*), he is growing more and more vindictive. This may be considered, not only as a reason why Jerusalem utters a cry to God, but as an argument addressed to God for His interposition. So CALVIN represents it: "The Prophet, in order to obtain favor, says, that enemies had *greatly exalted* themselves. And this deserves a special notice; for what seems to occasion despair to us, ought, on the contrary, to encourage us to entertain good hope, that is, when enemies are insolent and carry themselves with great arrogance and insult us. The greater and the less tolerable their pride is, with more confidence may we call on God, for the Holy Spirit has not in vain taught us this truth, that God will be propitious to us when enemies thus greatly exalt themselves, that is, when they become beyond measure proud, and immoderately indulge themselves in every kind of contempt."—W. H. H.]

Ver. 10. Since Zion [Jerusalem] has not preserved the sanctuary of her heart from pollution by the enemy of her soul, but has suffered that enemy to rob her of her spiritual treasures, she must not wonder if her earthly enemies desecrate by their presence her earthly sanctuary, and stretch out the hand towards its precious things. —**The adversary hath spread out his hand** [or rather, stretched it out, (so FUERST, NÆGELSACH, and ASSEM. *Annot.*), as about to seize and appropriate them.—W. H. H.], **upon all her pleasant things**. Precious, or glorious things. The vessels and treasures of the Temple are intended (see 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10; Jer. lii. 17 ff.), as is evident from the explanatory conjunction *for* with which the next clause begins: **for she hath seen that the heathen entered into her sanctuary, whom Thou didst command that they should not enter into Thy congregation**. In Dent. xxiii. 2, 3, we find the command never to allow Ammonites and Moabites to come into the congregation of the Lord. This special command was afterwards applied to all the heathen: Ezek. xlv. 7, 9; Neh. xiii. 3. We are reminded also of the Porch of the heathen, violation of which, according to Josephus (Jewish Wars, VI., 2, 4; comp. Acts xxi. 28), was forbidden on pain of death. [Observe the antithesis between *sanctuary* and *congregation*. BOOTHROYD expresses this in his translation, in which he says "the sense is given and not the idiom:" *Surely she hath seen nations enter into her sanctuary, whom Thou didst forbid to enter even into Thy congregation*. Those who were forbidden even to worship with the people, had intruded into the holy place—only priests might enter. "If even their entering to perform an act of worship would have been construed as a violation of the precept, how much more when it had for its object destruction and spoliation" (HENDERSON).—W. H. H.]

[NÆGELSACH translates: *For she saw heathen who came into her sanctuary*. It would be better to translate, *For she hath seen how heathen came, etc.* I have tried to preserve the same form of the verb בָּרָא in both clauses by making *heathen*

the object of one verb and subject of the other. If this is a fault, I share it in company with old HUGH BROUGHTON and with BLAYNEY. The CRANMER and BISHOPS' BIBLES give the sense excellently: "Yea, even before her eyes came the heathen in and out of the sanctuary; whom Thou (nevertheless) hast forbidden to come within Thy congregation."—It is difficult to preserve the force of the final word בָּרָא , without putting the clause in quotation marks. The possessive pronoun in the English version "*thy congregation*" must refer to the people, not to God.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 11. To dreadful spiritual distress is added the greatest bodily want, *hunger*. The Israelites must part with their jewels in order to procure necessary food. See ver. 19. [**All her people sigh**. The distress is real and universal. In ver. 4 the priests sigh; in ver. 8 the ideal person, Jerusalem, sigheth: but here we have, not a poetical image, but the actual groaning of the people, suffering with hunger and searching for food.—**They seek bread**, or rather *seeking for bread*. This expresses the reason for their sighing.—**They have given (they give) their pleasant things (precious things**, BROUGHTON, CRANMER, BISHOPS' BIBLE, HENDERSON, NOYES; *jewels*, NÆGELSACH, WORDSWORTH); **for meat (food)**. By *precious things* are, doubtless, meant those ornaments which oriental women value so highly. "A striking illustration of this is given by Mr. ROBERTS:—the people of the East retain their little valuables, such as jewels and rich robes, to the last extremity. To part with that, which has perhaps been a kind of heirloom in the family, is like parting with life. Have they sold the last wreck of their other property; are they on the verge of death?—the emaciated members of the family are called together, and some one undertakes the heart-rending task of proposing such a bracelet, or armlet, or ear-ring, or the pendant of the forehead, to be sold. For a moment all are silent, till the mother or daughters burst into tears, and then the contending feelings of hunger, and love for their 'pleasant things' alternately prevail. In general, the conclusion is to pledge, and not to sell their much-loved ornaments; but such is the rapacity of those who have money, and such the extreme penury of those who have once fallen, that they seldom regain them" (*Oriental Illustrations*, p. 483). "Under such circumstances, and particularly in times of public calamity, it often happens that jewels and other property of most valuable description, are disposed of for the merest trifle, that a little bread may be obtained to relieve the soul" (*Pictorial Bible*, Lon. See also *Comp. Comm.*).—W. H. H.]—**To relieve the soul** [marg. E. V., *to make the soul to come again*]. The meaning is evident from 1 Kings xvii. 21, 22; 1 Sam. xxx. 12; Jud. xv. 19. [To sustain life: lit., *to cause the breath, or life to return*. "This mode of expression is founded on the idea, that when one is faint, the breath or life is as it were gone" (HENDERSON). See Job ii. 4, "all that a man hath will he give for his life."—W. H. H.] **See, O Lord, and consider**. See vers. 9, 20; ii. 20; v. 1; comp. iii. 63; iv. 16.—**[For I am become vile. How wretched I am become. There**

is certainly, as HENDERSON remarks, "something incongruous in assigning her vileness as a reason why God should regard Jerusalem;" what is here meant is, as HENDERSON acknowledges while he retains the word "vile," "not her moral pollution, but her abject and despised condition, which was exposed to all around her." —NÆGELSBACH with the last clause of this verse begins an entirely new section. In all that follows, he says, down to ver. 16 Zion herself speaks. She entreats first Jehovah, then all passers-by to regard her misery. In fact, however, the address of Jerusalem to Jehovah begins with the last clause of ver. 9, and is continued down to end of this verse. The appeal to God in the last clause of ver. 10, *which Thou commandest, etc.*, and again this prayer to God at the close ver. 11, shows that the whole is addressed to Him: the use of the third person instead of the first in the first two clauses both of ver. 10 and ver. 11, does not refute this, as the change from the first to the third person is so frequent in Hebrew descriptive poetry.—W. H. H.]

PART II.

I. 12-22.

- ↳ VER. 12. Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?
Behold and see
If there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow,
Which is inflicted on me,
Wherewith Jehovah hath afflicted me
In the day of His fierce anger!
- ▷ VER. 13. From on high hath He sent fire into my bones,
And it subdued them.
He hath spread a net for my feet,
He hath turned me back.
He hath made me desolate—
All the day long sorrowful!
- ♪ VER. 14. The yoke of my sins is bound fast to His hand.
They are twined together,
They rise up above my neck.
He hath caused my strength to fail.
The Lord hath delivered me into the hands of those
Whom I cannot resist.
- ▷ VER. 15. The Lord hath made despicable all my mighty men
In the midst of me.
He hath proclaimed a set-time against me
To crush my young men.
The Lord hath trodden the wine-press
As to the virgin, Judah's daughter.
- ♪ VER. 16. For these things I weep.
Mine eye, mine eye—runneth down with water,
Because the Comforter—Restorer of my soul—
Is far from me.
My children are perishing
Because the enemy prevails.
- ▷ VER. 17. Zion stretches out her hands,
But there is no Comforter for her.
Jehovah has given charge concerning Jacob
That his neighbors be his enemies.
Jerusalem has become
An abomination in the midst of them.

- י VER. 18. Jehovah—He is righteous :
 For I have disobeyed His commandment.
 Hear, I pray you, all ye peoples,
 And behold my sorrow.
 My virgins and my young men
 Are gone into captivity.
- פ VER. 19. I called to my lovers :
 They deceived me.
 My priests and my elders
 Expired in the city,
 For they sought food for themselves
 To revive their souls.
- ח VER. 20. Behold, O Jehovah, how I am distressed !
 My bowels are greatly troubled.
 My heart is turned within me,
 For I have grievously rebelled ;
 Abroad the sword bereaveth,
 At home —Death !
- ש VER. 21. They heard that I sigh,
 That I have no Comforter.
 All my enemies heard of my trouble.
 They rejoiced that Thou hadst done it,
 That Thou hast brought the day Thou hadst proclaimed.
 But they shall be like me !
- ק VER. 22. Let all their wickedness come before Thee ;
 And do unto them
 As thou hast done unto me
 For all my transgressions :
 For my sighs are many
 And my heart is faint.

ANALYSIS.

From the last clause of verse 11, the Poet lets Zion [Jerusalem] herself speak, as she had done already, parenthetically, in ver. 9. This method of recital continues to the end of the chapter, with a single interruption, ver. 17, where the Poet himself throws in a word. [There is no necessity for supposing a change of speaker in ver. 17.—W. H. H.] Zion [Jerusalem] invites all who pass by, ver. 12, to convince themselves by their own observation, that there is no sorrow like unto her sorrow ; it streamed as fire through her bones, whilst at the same time a net had caught her feet, ver. 13. She was the victim of sins of her own sowing, in consequence of which she had been helplessly given up to mighty enemies, ver. 14 ; her heroes had proved themselves powerless, for her enemies had been called together against Judah as to a feast at the wine-press, ver. 15. It is most natural that Zion's [Jerusalem's] tears should flow without ceasing for such calamities, and all the more natural since after the catastrophe all hope failed her, ver. 16. By way of confirmation the Poet repeats, in his own words, the thoughts expressed by Zion [Jerusalem] in the preceding context, ver. 17 : that she stretches forth her hands for help in vain, that the Lord had called together all her foes against her, so that she now stood in the midst of them as an object of abhorrence. Vers. 18-22, Zion [Jerusalem] speaks again. Once more she repeats, vers. 18, 19, in the way of recapitulation, the acknowledgment of her sin, the invitation to consider her great distress, the description of the principal items of the same, the banishment of her efficient youth, the defection of human allies, the pitiable death by starvation of her venerable priests and elders. The last three verses are a prayer. May the Lord regard her misery ; the hopeful heart is broken by the blows of the angel of death, ver. 20. May the Lord bring upon her malignant enemies such a day of vengeance as He had brought upon Zion [Jerusalem], vers. 21, 22. The last two lines of ver. 22 are a final exclamation of pain, from which it is evident that the petitions offered to the Lord had not availed to allay the deeply-seated agony of mind.

I. 12.

- 12 *Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by ? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the LORD hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger.*

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 12.—**כָּל-עֹבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ**. This phrase is found in ii. 15; Job xxi. 29; Ps. lxxx. 13; lxxxix. 42; Prov. ix. 15.—**אִם-יֵשׁ**, comp. ver. 18. These words, by brevity and simplicity, are highly poetical.—**עֹלָל**. The Pual conj. occurs only here; the active in ver. 22; ii. 20; iii. 51; Jer. vi. 9 in the sense of *racemari* [to glean; so JEROME renders it in our text, *Who has gleaned me.*—W. H. H.], comp. Jer. xxxviii. 19.—**הִנֵּה-נָהָה**, see **נִגְוֹת חַיִּים**—**חַיִּים חַיִּים**. This expression is found only here and Is. xiii. 13. **חֲרִין אָפוֹ** is an expression common with Jeremiah, iv. 8, 26; xxv. 37, 38; xxx. 24; xlix. 37.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. Zion [Jerusalem] addresses herself now to men, especially to all “passers by,” in order to gain their attention and stir up their sympathy for her sufferings. [This address, according to NÆGELSBACH, extends to ver. 16, but in fact, to the end of ver. 19, when Jerusalem again addresses herself to Jehovah.—W. H. H.]—**Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?** The Hebrew is very difficult and hardly capable of a satisfactory explanation. It seems to me that the only allowable explanation is this: *not on yourselves (look), but look and see whether any sorrow is as my sorrow.* [See crit. note below. There is a difficulty first in deciding whether the first word in the Hebrew is a mere particle of wishing: *oh if, oh that, utinam, would that!* Or whether it is the particle of negation. If the former, then we may adopt BLAYNEY’S translation, “O that among you, all ye that pass by, ye would look and see, if there be a sorrow like unto my sorrow,” etc. Thus our text is a call for sympathy. But there is little in favor of this interpretation. But if the word referred to is a particle of negation, then there are other difficulties: is it a simple negative, or a negative of interrogation? In either case, what is the meaning? If it is a simple negative, we may explain it in several ways. 1. We may, as NÆGELSBACH does, connect the negative with the following verbs, *Look not on yourselves, but look and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow.* Or, 2. We may translate literally, *it is not to you, and then we may explain it in two ways: either as an enunciation of the fact that what had befallen her had not befallen them; so HUGH BROUGHTON, This hath not befallen you, O all that pass by the way. Consider ye and see if, etc.;* or it may be taken as a complaint that her sorrows were so slighted—and then the sense is, *It is nothing to you, i. e., you have no concern in it or care for it.* Or, 3. We may translate it in the form of a wish or prayer, ‘let not that befall you that hath befallen me.’ If we take the word interrogatively, then we may suppose a word omitted, ‘Whether or no shall I call upon you,’ etc.; or we may render it as the English version has it, and in favor of which we have the weight of authority on the part of translators and commentators: *Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?* WEST. ANNOT.: “Do ye make light of mine afflictions? or, do ye not regard them, and lay them to heart? as complaining that her calamities were so slighted by others, and endeavoring to move them to some commiseration of her. See somewhat the like form of speech in the prayer of those holy men to God, Neh. ix. 32.”—**Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto**

my sorrow, which is done unto me. WEST. ANNOT.: “The manner of persons that sit weeping and wailing, as wandering outcasts, by the wayside, is wont to be no other than is here deciphered, in a proneness to acquaint others with their calamitous condition (so ver. 18), and to aggravate them in relation of them, as being such as had never the like been known or heard of before. See iii. 1; iv. 6.”—**Wherewith the Lord (Jehovah) hath afflicted me in the day of His fierce anger.** See ver. 5. “By the transcendent greatness of mine affliction ye may easily perceive that there is a special hand and work of God in it. See Is. x. 5.” WEST. ANNOT.—W. H. H.]

לֹא אֵלֵיכֶם. The Sept. reads *οὐ πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, where without doubt we should read *οὐ πρ. ὑ.* Vulgate: *O vos omnes.* Chald.: *Adjuro vos omnes.* Syr., very literally: *Nihilne ad vos omnes viatores?* Arab.: *O quotquot viam transitis!* That the Sept.

read **לֹא** as **לֵא** is very probable. There is nothing that should prevent our pointing it so today, if any thing were to be gained by it. But **לֵא** (for which we have **לֹא**, 1 Sam. xiv. 30; Is. xlviii. 18; lxiii. 19) never stands as a simple interjection, but is a conjunction, and always requires a verb after it. We could indeed supply such a verb (Oh, that my call might compel your attention, or the like); but it is difficult to supply the right word, and we cannot conceive why the Poet should leave the reader to supply it. If

we read **לֹא** (which, according to the Masora, stands 35 times for **לֵא**, see FURST), then there are two ways of explaining it. Either it may be understood interrogatively: *nonne ad vos?* Then **אֵלֵיכֶם** must be supplied, as Prov. viii. 4 reads, **אֵלֵיכֶם אֵלֵיכֶם**. But there **אֵלֵיכֶם** is expressed. To supply it here, seems to me, were equally as difficult as the supply of a word after **לֹא** would necessarily be. Or, **לֹא** may be understood as a negation. In this sense ABEN EZRA and ROSENTHAL take it, whilst they supply the words **לֵא אֵלֵיכֶם**, i. e.,

hucusque non tetigit vos, quod mihi accidit; vos tanta mala, quanta nos opprimunt, nondum estis experti. But this explanation is evidently very arbitrary.

אֵלֵיכֶם is to be regarded as dependent on **הִנֵּה-נָהָה**, which is often construed with **אֵלֵיכֶם**. Num. xxi. 9; Ps. xxiv. 6; cii. 20; Is. xxii. 11, etc. This explanation is not, it is true, entirely satisfactory. But may not the forced construction arise from the constraint of the alphabetical arrangement of the text? [See remark above.]

לֹא here is the same as הֲלֵא, see FUERST and 1 Sam. xiv 30. The omission of the interrogation הֲ is accounted for by the desire to employ ל as the initial letter. HENDERSON: "לֹא is a strong

mode of expressing the negation **ἄν**, which has here all the force of a substantive put interrogatively, as it is in the common version: *Is it nothing?*"—W. H. H.]

L. 13-16.

13 From above hath he sent fire into my bones, and it prevaieth against them : he
hath spread a net for my feet ; he hath turned me back ; he hath made me desolate
14 *and* faint all the day. The yoke of my transgressions is bound by his hand ; they
are wreathed, *and* come up upon my neck ; he hath made my strength to fall ; the
LORD hath delivered me into *their* hands, *from whom* I am not able to rise up.
15 The LORD hath trodden under foot all my mighty *men* in the midst of me : he
hath called an assembly against me to crush my young men : the LORD hath trod-
16 den the virgin, the daughter of Judah, *as* in a wine-press. For these *things* I
weep ; mine eye, mine eye runneth down with water, because the comforter that
should relieve my soul is far from me ; my children are desolate, because the
enemy prevailed.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 13.—**מָרוֹם** occurs often in Jeremiah: xvii. 12, *etc.*; **מָפְרוֹם**, xxv. 30.—**עֲצָמוֹת**, Jer. viii. 1, and elsewhere.—**וַיִּרְדָּהָ**. The word is obscure. It is the Imp. Kal. of **רָדָה**. But **רָדָה** signifies to *tread upon, govern*. The subject can be **אֵשׁ**, since this word is also used as a masculine (**אֵשׁ לְהִט**, Ps. civ. 4). The singular suffix **נָהּ** refers to 'עֲצָמוֹת', since the bones are regarded as constituting one body. See NAGELS. *Gr.*, §105, 7, rem. 2. We translate, therefore, *and it subdued them*. [FUESTER: **וַיִּרְדָּהָ** and he caused it (the fire) to become master. BLAYNEY translates, *and hath caused it to penetrate into my bones*, and says, "This is obviously the right construction, and it is that which is approved by the LXX." But the Sept. uses the verb **καταγειναι**, and obviously neither that verb nor the Hebrew means to penetrate. All the other versions use the word 'prevail,' 'subdue,' or 'govern,' except BOOTHROYD, who blindly follows BLAYNEY.—W. H. H.] **רָדָה**, Jer. v. 31. Comp. Lev. xxv. 43, 46, 53.—**פָּרַשׁ**. See Ver. 10. **רֶשֶׁת** occurs not again in Lamentations and not at all in Jeremiah.—**הַשִּׁיבָנָה**. The Hiphil form, *caused me to turn*. This favors the idea of the net as the instrument of preventing escape; see below.—W. H. H.] **שׁוּמְכִין**, ver. 4.—**דָּוָה**. This word does not occur in Jeremiah. It is found, besides here, v. 17; Lev. xv. 33; xx. 18; Is. xxx. 22.

Ver. 14.—נָשָׂא־ is *an. ley*. The root נָסַר, which reappears in אָ־נָסַר, *ligare* (Gen. xxii. 9), אָ־נָסַר, *Aram. נָסַר, ligavit* (see נָסַר, *nodus*, Is. lviii. 6) *cal-ena*, kettle (observe the change of the aspirate to the sibilant, comp. *us* and *sus*, אָ־נָסַר and *silva*, וְנָסַר and *super*, אָ־נָסַר and *sal*, שָׁנָה, Ges. *Thes.*, p. 1318), seems to have the signification of *binding, tying*. Ewald conjectures that שָׁנָה may have been the common technical term for *harnessing*.—יָנַל, frequent in Jeremiah: ii. 20; v. 5; xxviii. 2, 4, 11, 14; xxx. 8. In יָנַל and יָנַל the Poet seems to aim at a play upon words.—פָּשַׁע occurs only vers. 5, 14, 22; Jer. v. 6.—The Hithpael הִשְׁתַּבֵּחַ only here; elsewhere only the Pual, Job xl. 7. [Boothroyd, translating עָלַי as if it were יָנַל, is compelled to translate שִׁיתֵּנִי in the sing., *His yoke He hath twisted on my neck*.—For a similar use of עָלַי, in the sense of rising above the object indicated, see Deut. xxviii. 43.—W. H. II.]—הִכְשִׁיל. Kal frequent in Jeremiah; Hiph., *labare fecit*, Jer. xviii. 15; Hoph. Jer. xviii. 23.—בִּיד־יָד. Construction as in Jer. ii. 8. See my *Gr.*, § 65, 2, f. [“A noun is sometimes put in the construct before a succeeding clause with which it is already connected,”—“particularly when the relation is itself omitted, בִּיד־הַשִּׁלָּה, *by the hand of him whom thou wilt send*” (GREEN’S *Gr.*). This construction renders it necessary to take קָם in a transitive sense; or else to introduce a word besides the relative; so E. V.: *from whom I am not able to rise up*. NOTES: *against whom I cannot stand up*. Whom I cannot withstand or resist. This seems to be the sense, and is not foreign to the use of קָם.—W. H. II.]

Ver. 15.—**סֶלָה**. Piel only here; Kal, Ps. cxix. 118; Pual, Job xxviii. 16, 17.—**אָפִיר**, often in Jeremiah, viii. 16; xlv. 15; xlvii. 3; i. 11. In Lam. only here.—**קָרָא מוֹעֵד**. Lev. xxiii. 4. See ver. 4. Jeremiah generally uses the noun in the sense of *tempus finum* [and that is its meaning here]. OWEN: *He hath brought on me the fixed time to destroy my young men.*—W. H. H.].—**לְשֹׁכֵי פֶחָיו**. A peculiar expression, yet see Jer. ii. 22.—**דָּרַךְ נָתַל**. A peculiar use of לָ [it seems to mean *with relation to, as to, quoad*].—W. H. H.]. **נָתַת**. In Jeremiah, yet he uses דָּרַךְ of the treaders of the wine-press, xxv. 30; xlviii. 33; li. 33.—**בְּתַחֲלֵית בַּת**, in Jeremiah once, of the Egyptians, xvi. 11, and once in the connection **בְּתַחֲלֵית בַּת עַמִּי**, xiv. 17; comp. xviii. 13; xxxi. 4, 21. In Lam., besides here, only in li. 13, comp. ii. 10.

Ver. 16.—**בֹּכִיָּה** (see **פְּרִיָּה**, Is. xvii. 6 and elsewhere; OLSH., § 177, 6) occurs only here. Yet Jeremiah uses **בָּכָה**, xli. 6, and **כִּבְכָּה**, xxxi. 15: in the last place in connection with **עַל**, as here: elsewhere **בָּכָה** is constructed with acc. viii. 23,

ל, xxii. 10, or כָּפַן, xiii. 17. [GREEN, *Gr.*, §209, 1, and PAULI, *Anal.*, p. 264, attribute the *form* to the fact that ' was originally the last radical of the verb. PAULI, in his *Key*, p. 63, n, informs us that "the Prophet uses the feminine gender for the purpose of expressing meekness and the intensity of his grief." A rather remarkable instance of a rule made to meet a supposed case. Fortunately we are not obliged to allow the Prophet to unsex himself, since not the Prophet himself, but the ideal and feminine Jerusalem is the speaker.—The verb, properly intransitive, is used in a transitive sense: *my eye runs down water*. A peculiar Hebrew idiom to express abundance, Joel iv. 18, הַרְבֵּה הָרַב, *the hills shall run milk*. See GREEN'S *Gr.*—W. H. H.]—The part. מְנַחֵם Jeremiah does not use.—שׂוֹכֵמִים, see ver 4.—נָכַר is found Jer. ix. 2.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 13–16 contain a particular account of the various sufferings endured, together with their efficient causes.

Ver. 13. The sufferings [of the city] appear under two images. The first image is derived from the fire that falls from Heaven (Gen. xix. 24; Deut. xxix. 23; Ps. xi. 6). Heavenly fire burns more fiercely than earthly; it cannot be quenched. [The image of fire is suggested by the last words of the preceding verse, "in the day of his fierce anger," which may be rendered in the day of His glowing or burning anger. So CALVIN, in *die exandescentie iræ suæ*.—From above, lit., from on high. CALVIN: "the expression is emphatical, for the Prophet means that it was no common or human burning; because what is ascribed to God exceeds what is human or earthly."—**Hath he sent fire into my bones.** CALVIN: "They who interpret bones of fortified places, weaken the meaning of the Prophet. I take bones in their proper sense, as though it were said, that God's fire had penetrated into the inmost parts. This way of speaking often occurs in Scripture.—David deplored that his bones were vexed or troubled, Ps. vi. 2. And Hezekiah said in his song, "As a lion he hath broken my bones," Is. xxxviii. 13."—W. H. H.]—**And it prevaleth against them.** *And it hath subdued them*, or got the better of them. [CALVIN: "The Prophet says that fire had been sent by God, which ruled in his bones,—that is, which not only burnt the skin and the flesh, but also consumed the bones." The CRANMER and BISHOPS' BIBLES translate very freely, but preserve the sense, "From above hath He sent down fire into my bones, and it burneth them cruelly."—W. H. H.]—The second image is derived from the hunter, who lays nets for the wild beast.—**He hath spread a net for my feet.** [CALVIN: "There is another similitude added, that God had spread a net before her feet,—and thus He had taken away every means of escape. She had been ensnared by God's judgments, so that she was bound over to ruin, as though she had fallen into toils or snares."—**He hath turned me back.** See ver. 8. This and the two following clauses contain ideas by means of which the poet seems to pass over from the image to the reality. [But is not this clause to be explained by the metaphor of the net, by which, when she sought to escape, she was turned back? So CALVIN understands it: "She had been turned back by the nets of God." Or we may explain it consistently with the metaphor, as the WESTMINSTER ANNOTATIONS do: "Cast me down backward; thrown me down and laid me on my back."—**He hath made me desolate, and faint all the day:** or, better, *sorrowful all the day*: so NAEGLSBACH and CALVIN.

CRANMER'S B. and BISHOPS' B. both render it, "He hath made me desolate, so that I must ever be mourning." CALVIN: "It is stated in the third place, that she was desolate all the day, so that she sorrowed perpetually."—W. H. H.]

Ver. 14. A third metaphor, which indicates the cause of the ruin which has befallen Zion [Jerusalem].—**The yoke of my transgressions is bound by His hand, to His hand.** Zion [Jerusalem] may not be relieved from her guilt, but rather it is tied fast upon her as a yoke. And truly this is done by God's hand. But what God binds, that He holds fast; no mortal power can loosen it. [HENDERSON: "The next metaphor is taken from agricultural life. As the hand of the ploughman firmly binds the yoke on the neck of the ox, so inseparably had the punishment of the iniquities of Jerusalem been connected with her rebellious conduct towards Jehovah."—There is some uncertainty as to the verb in this clause. In the Keri or Masoretic reading and in several MSS. and printed editions of the Bible, the verb used means *to be watched*: and the verb is taken in the sense of *watching* in the Sept., Syr. and Vulgate, and the old versions generally. It is singular that NAEGLSBACH does not refer to this reading, since it is the one adopted in the text of the German Bible. Dr. BLAYNEY and the Rev. JOHN OWEN, insist that this is the correct reading. All the versions and translators adopting this reading, except the Vulgate, take the word rendered *yoke* not as a noun, but as a preposition. Mr. OWEN translates thus: *He hath watched over my transgressions, by His hand they are twined*. This gives a good sense. "To watch over transgressions," is similar to 'watch upon (or over) the evil' in Dan. ix. 14; it is to watch over them in order to punish them" (J. OWEN). But the grammatical objections to this rendering are nearly insuperable. See *Crit. Note below*.—Another point of interest is whether we should translate *by His Hand, or in, or to His hand*. The former is adopted by NAEGLSBACH, HENDERSON and BOOTHROYD, and has the sanction of the English Version. The latter *in His hand*, is supported by Sept., Vulg., BISHOPS' BIBLE, CALVIN, BLAYNEY, and NOYES, and is recommended by the sense, and also best expresses the primitive sense of the preposition. The BISHOPS' BIBLE reads, *the yoke of my transgressions is bound fast to His hand*; and appends this note, "The bondage through sin is most grievous, which therefore is called the yoke of sins, fastened in or to God's hand because by no means it can be shaken off or remitted, but only of God's grace and mercy." NOYES: "The yoke of my transgressions is fastened in His hand. A metaphor drawn from the practice of a husbandman, who, after fastening the yoke upon the cattle, keeps the cords wound round his hand. So she says the yoke of her transgressions, i. e., the consequences of them, is fastened upon her

neck, and the cords connected with it wound round the hand of God, so that she could not throw it off." CALVIN has a long note to the same effect.—W. H. H.].—**They are wreathed and**, or, [leaving out the conjunction which is not in the original] **they come up—rise up above—upon my neck.** Comp. Ps. xxxviii. 5. As if the yoke were fastened by many cords, interwoven together, and forming, as it were, a heap or elevation upon the neck. The verbs being in the plural must have for their subject the word "transgressions," hence it is evident that he regarded the sins themselves as the cords which fastened the yoke on the neck. And very certainly sins constitute the bond between the guilty one and his guilt. [WORDSWORTH: "*My sins are twined together*, so as to fasten the yoke upon my neck. Comp. Deut. xxviii. 48. The reason of this comparison is that *sins* become *punishments* (*peccati pœna peccatum*), and are a sore burden, too heavy for the sinner to bear (Ps. xxxviii. 4)."] HENDERSON: "To express more forcibly the complicated character of the iniquities of the Jews as entailing punishment upon them, they are said to *entwine* or *interweave themselves*, the idea being probably borrowed from the intertwining of withes for the purpose of binding the yoke with them." The expression, *they come up upon my neck* (variously rendered, *they go over my neck* (BROUGHTON), *come up about my neck* (BISH. BIBLE), *rise up on my neck* (HENDERSON), *are laid upon my neck* (NOYES), may express the idea of a burden in addition to that of a yoke, that the sins wreath themselves into a yoke that is heavy and burdensome on the neck, "a yoke which is insupportable" (WORDSWORTH, NOYES),—or the idea may be, that the yoke is so wreathed together and knotted as it were upon the neck, that the head cannot be withdrawn from it. The last seems to be NAGELSBACH's idea. So CALVIN, "we ought to bear in mind the two clauses—that God's hand held the yoke tied, and also that the yoke was bound around the neck of Jerusalem, * * * it is tied, and so fastened, that it cannot be shaken off." So also BROUGHTON, who translates, *they plait themselves; they go over my neck*, and in a treatise on "Jeremie's Lamentations" explains this passage thus: "*The yoke of their sin was platted over their head.* The state in Jeremie's time was so entangled with the idolatry of the Egyptians and their other friends, that they could not get their head out of it."—W. H. H.] In what follows the Poet as in ver. 13, drops the metaphorical style for the literal.—**He hath made my strength to fall.** *He has broken my strength.* [The primitive meaning of the Hebrew verb suggests the idea of one tottering to and fro, staggering from weakness (see Is. v. 27), as, in the present instance, under a heavy yoke. Our E. V. vainly strives to preserve this idea in a phrase that is awkward and needs explanation, "*He has made my strength to fall.*" BLAYNEY comes nearer the primitive meaning of the verb by using the word "*stumble*" instead of "*fall*," *hath caused my strength to stumble.* But it is doubtful if the verb, in the form in which it is used, expresses more than the idea of weakening or exhausting the strength. OWEN: "*He hath weakened my strength.*" CALVIN: *corrue fecit (vel, debilitavit) robur meum.*

BISHOPS' BIBLE and HENDERSON: "He hath caused my strength to fail."—W. H. H.].—**The Lord hath delivered me into their hands, from whom I am not able to rise up, whom I cannot resist.**—The Lord, *Adonai.* This name, *Adonai*, never occurs alone in the prophecies of Jeremiah, but is always followed by *Jehovah* (and that, too, according to the Masoretic punctuation יהוה אדני, i. 6; ii. 19, 22; iv. 10; vii. 20; xiv. 18; xlv. 26, xlix. 5; l. 31. But in the Lamentations, *Adonai* is never followed by *Jehovah*, and stands alone in fourteen places, i. 14, 15 twice; ii. 1, 2, 5, 7, 18, 19, 20; iii. 31, 36, 37, 58 [see Introduction, Add. Rem., p. 32. If *Adonai* is the correct reading, its significance is thus explained by WORDSWORTH: "The prophet appears thus to intimate in the Lamentations, that now, in her captivity and humiliation, Jerusalem felt the lordship of Jehovah, the God of Israel; but by reason of her sins, no longer felt that lordship to be exercised by Him as JEHOVAH, i. e., as the God of His covenanted people, to protect them. A similar feeling made Solomon abstain in Ecclesiastes from the use of the name JEHOVAH altogether."]

[The argument of OWEN for reading נשקר instead of נשקר, that where all the versions agree, there is a strong presumption that they are right, is offset by the difficulty of construction in that case and the necessity it involves of changing על yoke into על upon in the first clause, and the verb עלו they rise up into the noun and pronoun עלה his yoke in the third clause. The difficulties of construction are evident in the translations of BLAYNEY and OWEN, the two advocates for this reading; BLAYNEY gives the verb in the singular a plural noun for its subject, *my transgressions have been closely watched*; and OWEN renders the verb, which is confessedly a passive verb and so rendered by the Sept. and all the old versions except the Vulgate, which OWEN himself says "hardly gives any meaning," in an active sense, *He hath watched over my transgressions*. A reading involving three changes in the Masoretic points, and even then incapable of correct grammatical construction, surely ought to be rejected.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 15 **The Lord hath trodden under foot.**—*Hath cast away, or rejected [despised or made despicable—W. H. H.].* This verse begins in the literal style of speaking, and ends in the metaphorical. [If our English version is to be retained, *trodden under foot*, then the metaphor is begun in the first clause, and beautifully developed as the verse proceeds. But the E. V. cannot be sustained, see *Critical Note* below.—W. H. H.] **All my mighty men,**—*Heroes, Ger. Helden* [FÜRST: *great men*].—**In the midst of me; in meiner Mitte.** [CALVIN. "She says, in the midst of me. And this ought to be observed, for if they had fallen on the field of battle, if they had been taken in the fields by their enemies, such a thing would not have been so grievous; but that they had thus been laid prostrate"—or rather, deprived of strength to resist and thus rendered contemptible,—"*in the very bosom of the city, was indeed a token of vengeance from above.*"—**He hath called an assembly**

against me.—*He has proclaimed a solemn feast [a set time.—W. H. H.] against me.—to crush my young men,—to break in pieces my young men.* As to a festive gathering the Lord calls her enemies to Jerusalem. The purpose of this festive gathering is indicated in a general way by the words *against me*; but is more clearly indicated by the words *to crush or break in pieces my young men*. In this expression is already shadowed forth the following metaphor; for the wine-press breaks to pieces, crushes the berries. [WORDSWORTH: "An oxymoron; the term to call an assembly signifies the gathering of a holy convocation for festal rejoicing, or other religious purposes. But now the religious festival of Jerusalem hath ceased (see ver. 4), and God has called an assembly of enemies to crush her. Compare the expression to sanctify war, or consecrate an army against a city. See on Isa. xiii. 3; Jer. vi. 4; li. 27, 28; Joel iii. 9."—Though it may impair a beautiful figure, it seems better to take כוּץ in its usual meaning of a set time. God appointed the time, as for a great solemnity, and it came according to His appointment the time to crush the young men.—W. H. H.]—**The Lord hath trodden the virgin, the daughter of Judah, as in a wine-press.**—*The Lord trod the wine-press of the virgin Judah's daughter.* We find substantially the same image used, Joel iv. 13; Isa. lxiii. 2, 3; Rev. xiv. 18-20; xix. 15. [OWEN: *The wine-press has the Lord trodden as to the virgin, the daughter of Judah.*]

כָּלָה. The meaning is *tollere, lüpfen* [to lift up, to remove a thing from its place, to cast it away, and thus to treat it with contempt, or to destroy it, as the case may be. The old lexicographers, tracing a remote analogy between this verb and כָּלַל, gave to it the sense of *treading down*, or *treading under foot*, which is adopted here by E. V., BROUGHTON, CALVIN, BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD and NOYES; but has not the sanction of the ancient versions. CRANMER and BISHOPS' BIBLE translate it *hath destroyed*. HENDERSON: *hath cast away*. So NÄGELSBACH: *verworfen hat*: so also the Sept., ἐξῆγεν, and the Vulg., abstulit. So also NOYES in Ps. cxix. 118, "Thou castest off all who depart from Thy laws;" which ALEXANDER translates, "Thou despisest all those straying from Thy statutes," in which he agrees with the Sept., ἐξουδένωσας, and with the Vulg., sprevisi. This sense, "Thou hast despised," is very suitable to our text. It is still better to give the Piel the force of Hiphil, *Thou hast caused to be despised*, or rendered despicable, "my mighty men in the midst of me." See CALVIN's note above on the words "in the midst of me," and observe how admirably then the first clause of this verse follows the last clause of the preceding verse: She is given up into the hands of those she cannot resist, and thus her mighty men in the midst of her are made objects of contempt. On the other hand, to translate as NÄGELSBACH, FUERST and HENDERSON, "The Lord has rejected, or cast away, all my mighty men in the midst of me," is awkward and not very intelligible.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 16. **For these things I weep.**—This refers back to ver. 12. Zion [Jerusalem] as-

serted in ver. 12 that no sorrow was like her sorrow. The correctness of this assertion is established, vers. 13-15, by matters of fact. Zion [Jerusalem] then, in ver. 16, refers in the words *for these things I weep*, back to the foregoing assertion, whilst she repeats the same with emphasis though in other words.—**Mine eye, mine eye.** The emphatic repetition of the same word is not infrequent with Jeremiah; iv. 19, vi. 14; viii. 11; xxiii. 25.—**Runneth down with water.** See iii. 48; Jer. ix. 17; xiii. 17; xiv. 17.—**Because the comforter.** See ver. 2.—**that should relieve** (marg., *bring back*) **my soul,—the Reviver of my soul:** see at ver. 11 [*The Restorer of my soul*, more nearly expresses the original, which is purposely generic and pregnant.—W. H. H.].—**Is far from me.** [Five times in this poem we have an allusion to an absent comforter; vers. 2, 9, 16, 17, 21. That there is an allusion to God the Holy Ghost seems evident. The addition of the words "Restorer of my soul," reminding us of Ps. xxiii. 3, makes this plain. DIODATI: "The comforter, namely, God by His Holy Spirit." It was the absence of God who comforts His people by His word and Spirit, that Jerusalem deplored, and she might have expressed her grief in the words of the Psalmist, "Why standest Thou afar off, O Jehovah? Why hidest Thou Thyself in times of trouble (x. 1)?" NOYES betrays the theologicum odium in his version, violating the grammar and changing the text, to destroy any possible reference to a Divine personality, "Far from me are they that should comfort me, that should restore my strength." We may translate כִּנְיָם the comforter, or a comforter, the one comforting, one that comforts, but cannot make plurals of it and כִּשְׁכִּי, or get the idea of "strength" out of נַפְשִׁי.—W. H. H.]—**My children are become desolate,—perished**, lit., *have become perishing*; same word as is used in ver. 4, "her gates are desolate"=destroyed.—W. H. H.]—**Because the enemy prevailed—prevails** [or has become more powerful. Some take this as if an explanation of the preceding,—that Jerusalem is comfortless because the children, who should comfort her, are themselves helpless. But this is too broad a distinction between Jerusalem and her children, and destroys the unity of the ideal image of the mourning daughter of Jerusalem. We are to take the last words as stating a result, rather than a cause of the helpless Jerusalem, forsaken of her comforter, who could restore her life, and therefore unable to prevent her children from perishing under the superior power of the enemy.—W. H. H.]

[מִיָּי. Mine eye, mine eye. BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD and NOYES omit the repetition on the authority of the ancient versions and some Hebrew MSS. All the other modern versions retain it; even the Douay departs from the Vulgate so far as to read "my eyes." We cannot agree with BLAYNEY that the repetition incumbers the metre. It is more difficult to account for the repetition in so many MSS. than for its omission in a very few. BLAYNEY feels this, when he taxes his ingenuity by suggesting that "perhaps מִיָּי may originally have followed בְּכִיָּה, and have been thus the ground of the transcriber's mis-

take." OWEN, the editor of CALVIN, says: "Though the *Sept.* and *Vulg.* do not repeat the 'eye,' yet the *Targ.* has 'my two eyes'" [so the German, *meine beiden Augen*] "and the *Syr.* 'mine eyes.'" *All* the ancient versions, there-

fore, do not omit the second יָי, as has been asserted. Most of the Heb. MSS. contain it: and it is very emphatic, highly poetical, and "quite in the style of Jeremiah."—W. H. H.]

I. 17.

17 Zion spreadeth forth her hands, and there is none to comfort her: the LORD hath commanded concerning Jacob, that his adversaries should be round about him: Jerusalem is as a menstruous woman among them.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 17.—פָּרַחָה. The construction of Piel with פָּ follows the analogy of the Hiphil, then too Piel may have a direct causative signification. See my *Gr.* §18. III., 2, 3; §69, 1, rem. 2. The Hiphil is found so construed in Jer. xviii. 16. See Ps. xxii. 8; Job xvi. 10. ["As the object of an action may, in certain cases, be regarded as the instrument with which it is performed, some transitive verbs admit a construction with פָּ, with" (GREEN'S *Gr.*, §272, 2, b) See Judg. iii. 27, בְּיָדָהּ. וַיִּתְּקֵה בְּשׁוֹפָר. BLAYNEY: "Five MSS. read בִּירָה, and the Roman edition of the LXX. represents χεῖρα αὐτῆς in the singular; but the Alexand. and Complut. editions read χεῖρας."—W. H. H.]—לִיעֶקֶב. לִ here is not a sign of the dative, but a preposition of place. [CHALDEUS explains, as quoted by ROSENMUELLER, 'Jehovah imposed on the house of Jacob the commandments and law, that they should keep them; but they themselves transgressed the decree of His word.' It is impossible to crowd so much meaning into three words. The ל obviously does not indicate a commandment given to Jacob, but a commandment given concerning Jacob. See לְכַתְּוִלַת, ver. 15.—The ancient versions which give נִירָה, ver. 8, the idea of wandering, all agree that נָרָה in this verse has the sense of uncleanness. Yet OWEN would insist on translating it here "a wanderer" or fugitive.—W. H. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. The excited speech, begun with last clause of ver. 11, ends with ver. 16, as if from sheer exhaustion. We get the impression from ver. 16, that Zion [Jerusalem] can speak no more on account of pain and tears. Therefore the Poet allows her a pause. He speaks again himself, in order partly to corroborate what has been said, and partly to adduce new matter. [There is no necessity for assuming a change of speakers. See remarks on vers. 11, 12.—The three ideal persons successively introduced in vers. 1-6, representing the city, the nation, and the Temple,—Jerusalem, Judah, and Zion,—appear again, grouped together, in ver. 17, but in a reverse order,—Zion, Jacob, and Jerusalem.—The poetical effect of this separate stanza, following and preceding several connected stanzas, is very fine.—W. H. H.]

Zion spreadeth forth—stretches out—her hands, and there is none to comfort her,—but there is no Comforter for her. See ver. 2. The underlying thought is evidently this: Zion imploringly stretched out her hands for help, but finds none, neither from men nor from God, for Jehovah Himself commanded her neighbors, from whom first of all help was to be expected, to behave in an unfriendly way towards her. [HENDERSON: "Spreading out the hands is a token of the greatest distress." The commentators generally agree in regarding this as a gesture indicating pain; some even regard it in the sense of wringing the hands; so CHALDEUS, quoted by ROSENMUELLER, *expandit Zion manus suas præ angustia, sicut expandit mulier, qui sedet ad pariendum.*" (See Jer. iv. 31.) But holding

up or stretching out the hands is a natural gesture of entreaty, and is constantly used in the Bible in connection with prayer to God. See especially Ex. ix. 29, 33; 1 Kings viii. 38; Is. i. 15; Ps. xlv. 21; cxliii. 6, where the same Hebrew verb is used as here. NÆGELSACH, ADAM CLARK and ASSEMBLY'S ANNOTATIONS give it this sense in our text. And it is exceedingly appropriate as an act of Zion, the ideal representative of the religious element of the theocracy and the seat of worship. Zion stretches out her hands in prayer, seeking the Divine Comforter (see ver. 16), but finds Him not: while Jacob, the representative of the theocratic people, is surrounded with enemies, and the queenly city, the seat of the theocratic government, is become an object of abhorrence.—The unusual occurrence in the Hebrew of the preposition *with* before the word *hands* led some of the Jews to adopt a singular translation, which DIODATI adopted in the Italian version: "*Sion distributeth bread to herself with her own hands.*" A description of the want of comfort, because that amongst the Jews, the kinsfolks and neighbors did use to bring food to them that mourned for the death of their nearest friends, inviting them to take food and to comfort themselves: see Deut. xxvi. 14; Jer. xvi. 7; Ezek. xxiv. 17; Hos. ix. 4." DIODATI'S *Annotations*.—W. H. H.]—The Lord [Jehovah] hath commanded—given a charge, see Num. xxvii. 19—concerning Jacob, that his adversaries should be round about him,—that his neighbors should be his enemies. The word translated in E. V. *round about him* does not indicate the place where his enemies were assembled, but is to be understood personally, as Jer. xlviii. 17, 39: Jehovah so ordered it that his neighbors became his oppressors.

[The use of the masculine pronoun *his*, instead of the feminine *her*, shows that there is a distinction between the ideal persons described. When the same person is introduced in ver. 3, under the tribal name of Judah, the feminine particles are used: but the substitution of the name "Jacob" suggests with propriety the idea of a man, rather than of a woman.—The use of masculine or feminine forms in Hebrew indicate often delicate

shades of feeling or depths of thought. See PAULI's *Analecta*, Lect. XXX.—W. H. H.]—**Jerusalem is as a menstuous woman among them**—*Jerusalem has become an object of abhorrence in the midst of them.* The consequence is that Zion [Jerusalem] at last stands in the midst of her oppressors as a woman defiled with blood and become an object of horror.

I. 18, 19.

- 18 The LORD is righteous; for I have rebelled against his commandment: hear, I pray you, all people, and behold my sorrow: my virgins and my young men are gone
19 into captivity. I called for my lovers, *but they deceived me*; my priests and mine elders gave up the ghost in the city, while they sought their meat to relieve their souls.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 18.—**כִּי־צָדִיק הוּא יְהוָה**. This phrase in full does not occur in Jeremiah. He uses **צָדִיק** alone, with an accusative following, iv. 7, comp. v. 23.—[HENDERSON: "For **עַמִּים** read with the Keri **הָעַמִּים** in the vocative." *All ye peoples*; BROUGHTON, CRANMER, CALVIN, BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, NOYES.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 19.—The Part. **כֹּהֵנִים** is found in Jeremiah, xxii. 20, 22; xxx. 14.—He also uses **רַבֵּי**, iv. 29, but not in Piel.—**נָתַן** is not found in Jeremiah.—[The **י** prefixed to **יִשְׁכְּבוּ** has the force of *in order that*, as in Job x. 20, and the phrase is fully translated by our infinitive.—The Sept. and Syr. add the words—and found none.—W. H. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. Vers. 18, 19 contain nothing new. They only recapitulate. But it is noteworthy that Zion [Jerusalem], who is now again in a condition to speak [see remarks on preceding verse], begins with an acknowledgment of the righteousness of God and of her own unrighteousness.—**The Lord is righteous**—*Righteous is He, Jehovah.* [OWEN: "Righteous He Jehovah: the pronoun is used instead of the verb *is*—a common thing in Hebrew."] This acknowledgment, that the Lord is righteous, is found in Jer. xii. 1. See Deut. xxxii. 4; 2 Chron. xii. 6; Ps. cxix. 137; cxxix. 4; cxlv. 17.—**For I have rebelled against His commandment.** Better, *disobeyed His commandment*, lit., *resisted His mouth*. The same expression occurs in Num. xx. 24; xxvii. 14; 1 Kings xiii. 21, 26.—**Hear, I pray you** [the Heb. particle of entreaty, **שָׁמַע**], all people [lit., *all peoples*], and behold my sorrow. Although willing to confess her guilt, yet Zion [Jerusalem] feels the need of human sympathy. She summons, therefore, as in ver. 12, all peoples to observe her sorrow. [Since men of the acknowledged taste of HENDERSON and NOYES sanction the use of the reduplicated plural *peoples*, we may be allowed to retain it; especially since no other word in English is its exact equivalent.—W. H. H.]—Then she recounts, as in vers. 13-15, the principal causes of her sorrow. The first is the captivity of her young women and young men, who are her pride and

strength.—**My virgins and my young men are gone into captivity.** See vers. 4, 5, 15.

Ver. 19. The second particular feature of her sorrow is, that her friends and allies had deserted her.—**I called for my lovers, but they deceived me**—*I called to my lovers, they deceived me.* See ver. 2.—The last and crowning cause of her sorrow is, that those who represented the dignity and honor of Zion [Jerusalem] are reduced to miserable extremities in order to preserve their lives.—**My priests and mine elders gave up the ghost**—*expired or perished*—**in the city.** [HENDERSON: "Elders, occurring as it here does in immediate connection with *priests*, is to be understood in an official sense, and not as simply indicative of old age. Both, without respect to dignity of office, were under the necessity of going in quest of food." They died *in the city*—not from the sword of the enemy on the battle-field, but while hemmed in by surrounding enemies, and seeking food in vain within the walls; they perished from sheer starvation.—W. H. H.]—**While they sought their meat to relieve their souls**—*for they sought food for themselves in order to revive their souls.* See vers. 6-11. [WORDSWORTH: "for they (even the priests and elders) sought for meat (and sought in vain) to recover their fainting souls." For themselves, **לָמוֹ**; ROSENMUELLER explains the pronoun as used in a reflexive or reciprocal sense. It is certainly emphatic, and suggests the severity of the famine, when the nobility are forced to go themselves in search of food to preserve their own lives.—W. H. H.]

I. 20-22.

20 Behold, O LORD, for I *am* in distress; my bowels are troubled; mine heart is turned within me: for I have grievously rebelled: abroad the sword bereaveth, at home *there* is as death. They have heard that I sigh; *there* is none to comfort me: all mine enemies have heard of my trouble; they are glad that thou hast done *it*: thou wilt bring the day *that* thou hast called, and they shall be like unto me. Let all their wickedness come before thee; and do unto them as thou hast done unto me for all my transgressions: for my sighs *are* many, and my heart *is* faint.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 20.—The sing. צָר never occurs in Jeremiah. See ver. 5. [NÆGELSBACH here, inadvertently (or else he would have cited this ver. at ver. 5), mistakes the noun צָר or צָרָה, used at ver. 5, for this צָר, which is 3d sing. perf. of צָרָה, and is so given by GESENIUS, FUEST and DAVIDSON, and is translated as a verb by nearly all the versions.—W. H. H.]—מַעַן in Jer. iv. 19; xxxi. 20.—חֲמַרְמַר, to *boil, move in an undulating manner*; except here and ii. 11, only in Job xvi. 16.—See OLSH., § 252, b.—The pause accent Aathenah belongs under קָרַב. [An unnecessary change of punctuation.—W. H. H.]—מַרָּה. See ver. 18. The Inf. מֵרָה is found only here.—The Piel שָׁכַל, in Jer. xv. 7. Comp. i. 9; Lev. xxvi. 22; 1 Sam. xv. 33. מְחַוֵּי, *foris*, Jer. xxi. 4.

Ver. 21.—שָׁמַעְנָה. The Sept. and Syr. improperly render it in the Imperative.—W. H. H.]—רָעָה, a very current word with Jeremiah.—שָׁשׂ, Jer. xxxii. 41.—עֲשֵׂיתָ as the antithesis of speaking, as Jer. iii. 5. [If we take *doing* here as the antithesis of *speaking*, the absence of the affix is emphatical. Thou hast *done, acted*, as well as *spoken*. This verb often occurs without an object expressed. See FUEST, *Lex.*—W. H. H.]—הִבָּאתָ, as Jer. vi. 19; xi. 11, and elsewhere.—קָרָא, of prophetic proclamation, Jer. ii. 2; vii. 2; xix. 2.

Ver. 22.—תָּבֵא. On account of the Imperative עֲוֹלָל, we must understand this as stronger than a wish: *let it come*, which is grammatically allowable. See my *Gr.*, § 89, 3 c.—The phrase בָּאָה רָעָה לִפְנֵי is not found in Jeremiah.—עֲוֹלָל. See ver. 12. [WORDSWORTH says, “the primary notion” of this word “seems to be that of *plucking*,” and refers to GESEN., 633. So CRANMER’S *B.*: *Thou shalt pluck them away even as thou hast plucked me*. The Sept. gives it the sense of *racemandi, gleaning*; and substitutes 3d person plur. for 2d sing., and does not translate לֵךְ at all. Καὶ ἐπιφύλλισον αὐτοῖς, δὲν τρόπον ἐποίησαν ἐπιφύλλιδα. The Vulg. takes it in the sense of gathering the vintage, and preserves the grammatical construction of the original: *vindemia eis sicut vindemiasti me*. Instead of the ἐπιφύλλισον of the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Alexandrinus has ἐπιφάλασσον, which seems to mean *reject them as vile*. That our version is correct would appear from the use of מַעֲלָלִים for *actions, doings, or deeds*. See Jer. xvii. 10; Prov. xx. 11. See ROSENMUELLER.—W. H. H.]—עַל כָּל-פִּשְׁעֵי. See vers. 5, 14.—אֲנַחְתִּי. Ver. 6.—לְבִי רִי- is found in Jeremiah, viii. 18, comp. Is. i. 5.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The Poet closes with a prayer, which is composed of an exordium, ver. 20 *a*; two principal parts: 1. Ver. 20 *b*, to ver. 21 *c*. 2. Ver. 21 *c*, to ver. 22 *c*; and a conclusion, ver. 22 *c*.

Ver. 20. Behold, O Lord; for I am in distress.—Behold, O Jehovah, how I am distressed! With these words, Behold, O Jehovah, how badly it fares with me, first of all, the attention of Jehovah is directed to Zion, and her misfortune is in general terms commended to His consideration.—The words Behold, O Jehovah, are the same as See, O Jehovah, of ver. 11.—Then follows the first part of the prayer, which extends to ver. 21 *c*, in which are successively detailed the causes of her distress, proceeding from those of an internal to those of an external character. 1. We have her sufferings subjectively considered, in two particulars.—(a). My bowels are troubled. [HENDERSON: *My bowels are made to boil*. NÆGELSBACH: *Meine Eingeweide wallen siedend auf*. The Hebrew word “is strongly expressive of that violently excited state of the intestines which is occasioned by excessive grief” (HENDERSON),

or rather, which was employed as an image of mental perturbations and distress.—W. H. H.] (b).—Mine heart is turned within me. The expression is found in *this* sense, of the turning of the heart as a symptom of the most painful affection, only elsewhere in Hos. xi. 8. In another sense, Ex. xiv. 5.—2. We have a statement of the reason which has occasioned her chastisement.—For I have grievously rebelled. Since I rebelliously have rebelled. These words belong evidently to what follows, and accordingly the particle at the beginning is not *for*, but *since, or because*. For the first and immediate result of disobedience was the punishment described in what follows, rather than the suffering caused by that punishment. Besides if this clause belongs to what precedes it, then the first half of the verse has four members, and the last only two. [The sense is not affected, whether we connect this with what precedes, or with what follows. The irregular division of the verses is too common to authorize here a change in the Masoretic punctuation, such as NÆGELSBACH proposes (see *Gram. note above*), merely for the sake of an equal division of this verse.—W. H. H.]—3. We have the punishment itself in declarations of concentrated meaning.—Abroad

the sword bereaveth, at home there is as death.—*Rages without the sword, as within Death.* For the sense according to kindred places, we have Jer. xiv. 18; Ez. vii. 15. By death in antithesis to the sword it is natural to understand, death wrought by hunger, or pestilence. See Jer. xv. 2; xviii. 21. [BOOTHROYD: "Death as it were acting in propria persona, and not by the instrumentality of another, as when a person is slain by the sword" (*Biblia Hebraica*). See Jer. ix. 21; IIab. ii. 5. ADAM CLARK gives examples from the poets of similar personification of death.—W. H. H.]

צָרָה לִי, impers. lit., it is strait to me, that is, I am in a strait, I am distressed, I grieve. צָרָה לִי seems itself a cry of distress, the sharpness of which is lost in the E. V., for I am in distress.—*My bowels, etc.* It seems impossible to reproduce this in an English form; at least our ideas of the commotions of the bowels have no association with agitations of the mind. To say with HENDERSON, "my bowels are made to boil," though it seems to be sanctioned by the meaning of the verb, yet does not really express the idea of violent motion, as witnessed in boiling water, or the surging of the ocean, which is the idea intended. To say with NOYES, *My bowels boil*, is worse yet, as the verb is strictly passive. If we might be allowed to ignore the figure, and say simply, *my mind is greatly agitated*, we would more correctly interpret the words to English ears, than by a figurative use of the word *bowels*, that never was ingrafted into English thoughts and feelings. If we could accept the opinion that in ancient usage the word *bowels* denoted the upper viscera and was not restricted as by modern usage to the lower viscera (see ALEXANDER on Is. xvi. 11), we might substitute the word *bosom* with advantage. But accepting the usual signification of צָרָה, we can give to חֲרָבָה no other English form than we have done, *greatly troubled*. OWEN: "*Troubled, or disquieted*, is the rendering of all the versions, and also of the Targ. As it is a reduplicate, the verb means greatly troubled or greatly disturbed, or violently agitated." לִי צָרָה נִהְיָה. ROSENUELLER refers to a similar phrase in Ps. xxxviii. 11; לִי חֲרָרָה, *cor meum circumlit, circumagitur*: ALEXANDER explains it of "the palpitation of the heart, denoting violent agitation."—W. H. H.]—The reading בְּפִתָּה, whatever may be urged against it, is very old, for the Sept. has ὡς περὶ θάνατος. But it is impossible to attach to this פ (if it be understood here as a particle of comparison, or as a so-called Kaph veritatis), a pertinent sense. For בְּפִתָּה stands here in antithesis to מָחִיץ שְׂבִלָה; is their common predicate; and to fill out the sense there should be a subject indicated corresponding to חָרָב. To supply חָרָב again, or with EWALD the idea "*something similar*" before בְּפִתָּה, would give us a construction in the highest degree forced and unnatural. Unless we suppose a mistake of the transcriber and read simply הִפְתָּה, as the Syriac has it, there is nothing left but to transpose the words, and to read בְּפִתָּה בְּפִתָּה, which

the text of the Sept. seems to sanction, for since the Sept. translates ὡς θάνατος ἐν οἴκῳ, its authors apparently read the Hebrew words in the order indicated. [ROSENUELLER: "PAREAU regards the ב, placed before מָחִיץ in this place, not as the particle of *similitude*, but what the Grammarians call the ב *veritatis*, which not seldom is used for the name of the thing or person referred to. But I prefer to suppose, with LÆWE and WOLFFSOHN, that the words are to be transposed,

מָחִיץ שְׂבִלָה חָרָב בְּפִתָּה, as death within."—HENDERSON has a curiously unsatisfactory remark, which his translation does not clear up, "the Caph is the Caph veritatis expressing the reality of the thing." What "thing?" Famine or pestilence? We must either adopt NÆGELSBACH's opinion, with which Sept., Syr. and Arab. agree, and transpose the words, *Abroad the sword has bereaved me, as death at home*; or suppose an awkward prosopopœia in the substitution of the word *death* for *famine or pestilence*, in which case the ב is strictly the ב *veritatis*; or we must translate as HENDERSON (though his translation is at variance with his explanation), *Abroad the sword bereaveth, in the house it is as death*, and accept the suggestion of CALVIN, that the ב is the ב of *similitude*, at home it is as death, as if he would say, nothing met them at home but that which was like death itself. There is as little, if not less, difficulty in the first of these explanations, as in either of the others.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 21. 4. We have the rejoicing of her enemies at her misfortunes. This subject, now first alluded to, the Poet dwells upon at some length, whilst he only briefly indicated the matters that have been mentioned.—**They have heard that I sigh, there is none to comfort me, that I have no comforter.**—All mine enemies have heard of my trouble. What the enemies heard is described as if it came to them borne on successive waves of rumor, proceeding by degrees from the circumference to the very centre of their grief. At first they heard how Zion [Jerusalem] bitterly mourned, because left alone, without Comforter and Helper (see ver. 2), she was exposed to the violence of her enemies. Then they [her enemies] began to comprehend the nature and extent of her misfortune. But they rejoiced that Jehovah had done it, that is to say, He had actually brought about the day which He had before predicted.—**They are glad that Thou hast done it, Thou wilt bring the day that Thou hast called** (Marg., *proclaimed*). They rejoiced because Thou hast done it, that Thou hast brought the day Thou hadst proclaimed. It will be observed that I take the last clause as epexegetical. This seems to me necessary. For, 1. To give a precatory sense to the last clause [as LUTHER, *let the day come*; HENDERSON: *Bring the day which Thou hast announced*; NOYES: *O bring the day which Thou hast appointed*.—W. H. H.] is very forced. 2. These words are a very suitable explanation of the preceding clause: the Lord *has done it* by bringing about in fact the day He had predicted or proclaimed, that is to say, He had not merely spoken, but acted [not merely threatened, but carried His threat into execution, by *doing* what He had said

He would do]. Least of all can we say, *Thou bringest, Thou proclaimest the day*, for this would require a change in the order of the words in the Hebrew, and the text should read יוֹם תְּבַרֵּךְ. EWALD, following the Sept. [Ἐπ' ἡμέρας ἡμερᾶν, ἐκάλειπας καιρόν], supplies אֵינִי [an appointed time] after תְּבַרֵּךְ. This is unnecessary and arbitrary.

[CALVIN explains this clause as NAEGELSBACH does: and his English translator, OWEN, remarks: "Our version is wrong in rendering this clause in the future tense. The reference is not to the day of vengeance to the Babylonians, but to the day of vengeance which God had brought on His own people. The versions, except the Syr., give the verb in the past tense." So WORDSWORTH: "They are glad that Thou hast done it; that Thou hast brought (upon me) the day (of sorrow) which Thou hadst proclaimed (by Thy prophets, who warned me of my impending destruction)."—W. H. H.]. That the Lord had threatened the people of Israel with eventual destruction, was well known to the heathen. See Jer. xl. 2, 3.—**And they shall be like unto me.** The second principal part of the prayer begins with this petition, that the Lord would visit her enemies with the same fate which had befallen her. [WORDSWORTH: "The Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites, who exulted over the destruction of Jerusalem, will share the same fate, at the hand of the same enemy. See iv. 21; Jer. xii. 14; xxv. 21; and Babylon herself also will be punished for her cruelty to Zion (Jer. i. 9, 10; li. 35; Is. xlvii. 6)."]

It cannot be objected to the above interpretation, that then the adversative sentence should begin with הֵן, for the subject of the adversative sentence is the same as that of the preceding one, only viewed in a different light. Whilst what precedes shows what the enemies hitherto had done (שָׂשׂוּ, שָׂכְנוּ, שָׂכְרוּ), the adversative sentence shows what in the future will be done to them: therefore, from שָׂכְרוּ to תְּבַרֵּךְ the perfect only is used, from הֵן the imperfect only. If the sentence began with הֵבֵא, the proper grammatical construction would be הֵבֵא יוֹם תְּבַרֵּךְ.

כִּנְיָ. ROSENMUELLER: "In the repetition of this word there is emphasis, as below, iii. 43, 44; Ps. cxxiv. 1, 2. The introduction of this verb, at first, without a subject expressed, was doubtless an expedient suggested by the alphabetical arrangement of the verses which required an initial שׁ; but its introduction in the next clause, with the subject expressed, and that in an intensified form,—"*heard* (have they) that I sigh," etc.—"*ALL my enemies heard of my trouble*,"—is one of those triumphs of the art of the true poet, by which he makes even the artificial and arbitrary laws of poetry contribute to the force and beauty of his sentiments."—פ. OWEN: "There are here two instances of כִּנְיָ being carried on to the next clause,—

Heard have they that I sigh, that I have no comforter:
All mine enemies have heard of my evil: they have rejoiced
That Thou hast done it, that Thou hast brought the day
Thou hast announced."

It is better, however, to consider each כִּנְיָ as

uniting the two clauses that follow it as in close apposition, in each case the latter clause being explanatory of the preceding one: *They heard that I sigh, I have no comforter, i. e., I sigh because I have no comforter. They rejoiced that Thou hast done it, Thou hast brought the day, i. e., Thou hast done it by bringing the day.—Thou hast done it.* The gloss of the famous Jew, JARCHI, quoted by ROSENMUELLER, is singular, and shows what far-fetched interpretations of Scripture have been allowed: "Thou hast afforded the occasion why my enemies have hated me and rejoiced in my misfortune, because Thou hast given us commandment not to eat and drink what they do, nor to enter into marriages with them. If only I had joined myself in marriage with them, they would have been disposed to pity me and the children of their own daughters."—W. H. H.]

Ver. 22. **Let all their wickedness come before Thee.** The expression *come before Thee* is to be understood in the sense of becoming acquainted with. See Gen. xxxvii. 2.—**And do unto them as thou hast done unto me for all my transgressions** [see gram. notes above]. **For my sighs are many and my heart is faint.** The conclusion of the prayer contains a declaration of fact. It is impossible to refer this to the thoughts immediately before expressed: for neither confession of sin ("for all my transgressions"), nor prayer for the retribution of the injustice done by her enemies ("do unto them as they have done unto me"), could suggest this concluding sentence. Rather, it relates generally to the prayer for help, which is contained as well under the second head, as in the first part of the prayer. This last clause, containing the evidence of her need of help, naturally recalls the prayer for help.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Vers. 1-3. This change of fortune, befallen the holy city and holy people, may well claim our sympathy in the highest degree. But at the same time we should let it be to us a solemn warning. For if this was done to the green tree, what shall be done to the dry (Luke xxiii. 31)? If God rejected the people whom He called the apple of His eye (Deut. xxxii. 10), if He exposed to destruction the city, in reference to which He said, that "His fire is in Zion, and His furnace in Jerusalem" (Is. xxxi. 9), what claim can the people, kingdoms and dynasties of the Gentiles have?—what claim can the particular Christian churches even have?—what claim can Rome, Geneva and Wirtemberg have to the privilege of eternal existence? Truly, since the Lord could destroy Jerusalem and entirely lay waste Canaan, without being unfaithful to His promise given to the Fathers, even so He can remove the candlestick of every particular Christian church, without breaking the promise given to the church at large, that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it (Matth. xvi. 18).

2. Vers. 1-11. "From Jeremiah's passionate lamentation over the wretched condition of the Jewish land and people, we derive a lesson in reference to the manner in which one in great affliction and misery may be allowed to behave.

There have been found, among the heathen, persons reputed for wisdom, some of whom have held the opinion, that a wise, intelligent man should be altogether emotionless, neither rejoicing in good fortune, nor cast down by bad fortune, but willing to let things be as they are. But we see the very opposite of this in pious, holy persons, especially here in Jeremiah, where he bitterly laments the misery of his people and fatherland. Could he have hoped for deliverance from that misery, or any mitigation of it, how heartily would he have rejoiced! And such emotions, if properly controlled, are not obnoxious to God, since He Himself has implanted them in our human nature. As it would displease a faithful father, should his children laugh when he punished them, so it cannot please God when His people show no sign of grief on account of His chastisements. If we should, in the ordinary affairs of life, rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep (Rom. xii. 15), and as the elect of God, holy and beloved, should manifest hearty commiseration towards the suffering (Col. iii. 12), much more should we, in times of general and national calamities, not then be joyful, but heartily mourn and lament on account of the losses and evils suffered by the public generally. Those who do not so, the Lord God reproves; because they eat and drink joyfully, and are not at all concerned for the calamity of Joseph, He threatens severely to punish their false security." WUERTEM. SUMM.

3. Ver. 1. The Targum Jonathan compares the destruction of Jerusalem with the expulsion from Paradise: "It was with Jerusalem as with Adam and Eve, when they were judged, who were ejected from the Paradise of pleasure, and then the Governor of the universe lamented over them."—ORIGEN conceives that under the image of Jerusalem, formerly noble and splendid, but now become widowed and servile, the human soul is represented: "In a sublimer sense, Jerusalem, in the enjoyment of felicity, abounding in people and nations, and the head of provinces, is the (divina est anima) soul which is of divine origin. * * * Even as we are permitted to see Jerusalem, living in the greatest prosperity, with a large population, crowded with foreigners, and head of the provinces, but when virtue fails, desolate and widowed and enslaved, so that it becomes tributary to the enemy that conquered it, so it happens to the soul of him who has fallen from virtue." GHISLER, p. 11.—So also OLYMPIODORUS: "She became as a widow, having been deprived of the bridegroom—the Logos."—So also RHABAN MAURUS: "Lamentation is made for the faithful soul of man, which formerly was full of virtues and controlled its various passions, governing the appetites of the flesh; but afterwards inflamed by the fire of lust through the agency of malignant spirits, deprived of angelical consolation and wanting divine communion, it was given over to serve as many masters as it had vices." *Ibid.*, p. 10.—HUGO A SANCTO VICTORE: "When God reigning in our hearts governs us, then the flesh subjected serves Him in the outward life, and in proportion as we are inwardly more humbly submissive to Him, we have in a stronger degree the mastery over the outward life. Thus, therefore, our soul, when it

had God for its King, was within 'full of people,' i. e., of virtues, and without was also 'mistress of the nations'—that is, of carnal desires, and 'a princess of provinces'—that is, of the bodily senses. But now she is 'solitary,' because she has lost her king; she is a 'widow,' because she is separated from her husband; she is 'tributary,' because she serves the vices to which she is subject." *Ibid.*

4. Ver. 1. Jerusalem, in this passage, is regarded by many as a type of the church. So says PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS: "The Prophet mourns, not only because she sitteth in garments soiled with dust and earthly deeds (sedet pulvereis et terrenis operibus sordidata), but especially because she 'sitteth solitary.' Solitary, moreover, because 'as a widow.' And widowed, because she has been deserted by her husband on account of the filthiness of her turpitude. But it should be observed that she is said to be 'as a widow,' and not really a widow; since, although she is despised by her spouse, yet her rights of marriage remain, so that if she should reform and discharge the duties of her former love, she may at least receive her husband and immortality through her penitence." GHISLER, p. 9.—HUGO A SANCTO VICTORE allegorizes in another fashion: "How is it that while we perceive so many people in the church, we see the church herself 'solitary?' Because we can find hardly any one who may be esteemed as truly with the church. * * * As Christ remains untouched by the crowd pressing upon Him (Mark v. 24-34), so the church, the body of Christ, 'sitteth solitary' amidst a multitude, because the Catholic faith has many professors, but few imitators." *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 10.—In another way still, the ABBOT RUPERT VON DEUTZ: "What city is it that was 'full of people,' etc.? That holy city, Jerusalem, forsooth, the mother of us all, whose citizens we are, whosoever of us are believers. That city, before the creation of the world, was already full of people in the foreknowledge or predestination of God. * * * How has it come to pass that she should sit solitary, should become as a widow, should pay tribute? Forsooth by transgressing; namely, by one man's sinning, the first man's, for in him the whole multitude of his posterity sinned and suffered condemnation. Thus has it come to pass that the holy city should sit solitary—should sit, as it were, as a widow, not having her husband—God, a church holy through faith, though cast out of Paradise, a wanderer in this world, suffering through exile, death and an offended Lord—that is, paying penal tribute for sin." *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[5. Vers. 1-11. With regard to the allegorical and mystical interpretations of this song, we may adopt the language of KITTO on 1 Sam. xvii.: "Although we do not, with some, think that 'these things are an allegory,' * * * it is impossible for the experienced Christian to read it without being reminded of eventful passages in his own spiritual history. There is no doubt some mysterious connection between even the external things of Scripture history, and the inner things of our spiritual life, which 'the wise' are enabled, by the Spirit's teaching, to discern, and which renders the seemingly least spiritual parts of the holy writ richly nourishing to their souls"

(*Daily Bible Illustrations*).—SCOTT: "The serious mind perceives abundant cause to meditate, with solemn awe and deep concern, on the tokens of His indignation at the sins of men. * * * How is it that so many populous cities now sit solitary? That so many flourishing empires are now become tributary and enslaved? Whence are the tears, with which vast multitudes wear away their restless nights and joyless days; whilst they mourn the loss of dear relatives, the treachery of professed friends, the cruelty of enemies, the oppression of the powerful, the fury of persecutors, grievous servitude and multiplied afflictions? Whence is it, that idolaters now occupy the places where flourishing churches once were? That the ways of Zion are deserted, her ordinances interrupted or profaned, her gates desolated, her priests and people in bitterness, or cut off? How is it that the adversaries of the church are the chief, and prosper, and that her children are in captivity? However we may vary our inquiries, the same answer recurs: the fierce anger of the Lord for man's transgressions hath filled the earth with sighs and groans, with tears, sickness and death. * * * Sin fills our consciences with remorse and our hearts with terror; deprives the soul of strength and confidence; perverts every pleasant thing and every good gift of God, and even His truths, Sabbaths and ordinances into occasions of deeper condemnation and misery. * * * Among the manifold evil effects of sin, the pious mind is peculiarly grieved, when, being committed by professors of true religion, it causes the enemies of God to blaspheme, and to mock and scoff at the truths and ordinances of His word and worship. Wo be to the world because of such offences: and wo be to those by whom such offences come, except their repentance be as deep as their transgressions are aggravated. We ought to prefer any of the other temporal effects of sin to this. Should any be wonderfully brought down from the height of affluence to the depth of penury; should their honor be changed for contempt; should they have no comfort in affliction, and be constrained to part with all their pleasant things for bread to sustain life; nay, should they have the prospect of dying by famine; yet all this ought to be considered as far less afflictive than that their sins should cause the name, truths and ordinances of God to be blasphemed; and men to stumble and fall and perish forever, through the increasing prejudice, hardness and impiety that they have excited. Even the profanation of sacred things, and the sacrilege of those who, in different ages, have laid their rapacious hands on the substance which was dedicated to the support of religion; and the contempt with which the clerical office hath been treated by profligates and infidels, have in great measure been chargeable upon the atrocious sins of professors and preachers of the gospel, who have rendered themselves vile, and exposed themselves to shame by their evident misconduct: and therefore the Lord hath made them vile and contemptible even to the most abandoned of mankind." (*Practical Observations*).—W. H. H.]

6. Vers. 1-3. "If God's chastisements begin, they come not once, twice, or thrice only, but they follow one after another, as one wave pursues

another in a tempestuous ocean (Ps. xlii. 8). For no misfortune comes alone, as is plainly seen in the present instance in the case of the Jews." CRAMER according to EG. HUNNIUS (*Ser.* 2, p. 28).

7. Ver. 4. "What an unspeakable blessing of God it is, when He gives public tranquility, so that people may come in crowds and regularly observe the holy rites of Divine worship, the world knows not, until God creates a famine of His Word and people seek for it over land and water without finding it. Let us be admonished to love the Word of God and the sanctuary where it is preached. Example: David, Ps. xxvi. 8; xxvii. 4." CRAMER by EG. HUNNIUS (*Ser.* 2, p. 19). "O how many people there are who sigh after the precious gospel and have willingly gone in crowds over many miles to the places, where alone they could obtain and enjoy it. These will on that day stand up and condemn those, who have had it at their very doors, and yet have regarded it so disdainfully and treated it so carelessly." EG. HUNNIUS, *Ser.* 2, p. 20.

8. Ver. 5. "God has, on account of Zion's sins, set her enemies in authority over her. What does not this signify! The enemy governs at pleasure! Thus the church must be trodden under foot by the world—and this drives her anew to penitence and prayer. The youth must go bound into slavery. To be obliged to see this, breaks the heart. He who will not understand that it is the enemy of souls, who leads the children, bound by lusts and false doctrine, to hell, that person must regard every thing that he reflects upon in a gross and literal sense." DIETRICH.

9. Ver. 5. "The devil is the author of our spiritual captivity (Col. i. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 26). Christ is our Redeemer (John viii. 36), the means of redemption are—in respect to the price paid (*ratione acquisitionis*) the blood of Christ (Zech. ix. 11; Col. i. 14),—but with regard to its actual application to us (*respectu autem exhibitionis*) the Word and Sacraments, especially Baptism which by ST. BASIL, in his Homily on 'Holy Baptism,' is called '*the ransom for captives*' (Isa. lxi. 1)." FÖRSTER.

10. Ver. 5. FÖRSTER here considers the question, how the participation of children in the sufferings of their parents for sins of which the children are innocent, may be explained. He refers in this connection to LUTHER's explanation of Ex. xx. 5, where it is said: "This question, why the son suffers for the father, the prophet Ezekiel hath treated of and says (xviii. 2), 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge;' and Jeremiah says (xxxi. 29?), 'Our fathers have sinned and are gone, but we must suffer for their sins;'—and it is still so in our days; we sin and deserve what those who come after us must suffer. We are not to understand by this that the child is damned on account of the father, as if it referred to the [eternal] punishment of souls. 'All souls,' says God by Ezekiel (xviii. 4), 'are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth it shall die.' But we should understand this of temporal punishment; He punishes children on account of the fathers, by letting them die who must yet at any rate die."

11. Ver. 5. **For the multitude of her transgressions.**—"If thou fearest not sin, fear at least that which sin leads to." AUGUSTIN by FÖRSTER.

12. Ver. 6. **Her princes have become like harts, etc.**—"The deer is an extremely timid animal, and on that account the heart of a deer is reproachfully imputed to the timid, as appears by this verse of HOMER: "O son of Atreus, having dog's eyes and the heart of a stag." And the Apothegm of Philip of Macedon from STROBILUS is well known: 'an army of stags with a lion for a leader, were better than an army of lions with a stag for a leader.'" FÖRSTER.

13. Ver. 6. **All her beauty is departed.**—"Now they will consider well the mercies of the Lord they formerly possessed, and how little they had valued them. Such reflections God awakens by means of affliction, and herein again is mercy, though enjoyed only in the midst of tears." DIEDRICH.

14. Ver. 7. **And did mock at her Sabbaths.**—"A corresponding punishment (*pœna æquivalens*) answers, by the just judgment of God, to the sin of Sabbath profanation; viz., the *derision* of the Sabbath (comp. GREGOR. NAZIANZ. The festivals of the people become the door of sins)." FÖRSTER. [ADAM CLARKE: "The Jews were despised by the heathen for keeping the Sabbath. Juvenal mocks them on that account:

Cui septima quæque fuit lux
Ignava et partem vite non attigit ullam. Sat. V.

'To whom every seventh day was a blank and formed not any part of their life.' ST. AUGUSTIN represents Seneca as doing the same:—"Inutiliter id eos facere affirmans, quod septimani fermè partem ætatis suæ perdent vacando, et multa in tempore urgentia, non agendo lædantur. 'That they lost the seventh part of their life in keeping their Sabbaths; and injured themselves by abstaining from the performance of many necessary things in such times.' He did not consider that the Roman calendar and customs gave them many more idle days than God had prescribed in Sabbaths to the Jews."]

15. Ver. 7. **Jerusalem remembered.**—Sinning first and remembering afterwards has brought many into great trouble.

16. Ver. 8. **Jerusalem hath grievously sinned.**—"We, Jerusalem, must suffer on account of our sins, and this chiefly makes our sorrows so very bitter: sin is the sting of death and of every evil." DIEDRICH. [CALVIN: "Here the Prophet expresses more clearly and strongly what he had briefly referred to, even that all the evil which the Jews suffered proceeded from God's vengeance, and that they were worthy of such a punishment, because they had not lightly offended, but had heaped up for themselves a dreadful judgment, since they had in all manner of ways abandoned themselves to impiety. It is common to all to mourn in adversities; but the end of the mourning of the unbelieving is perverseness, which at length breaks out into rage, when they feel their evils, and they do not in the meantime humble themselves before God. But the faithful do not harden themselves in their mourning, but reflect on themselves and examine their own life, and of their own accord prostrate

themselves before God, and willingly submit to the sentence of condemnation, and confess that God is just."]

17. Ver. 9. **[Her filthiness is in her skirts.**—"Much of the Jewish law is employed in discriminating between things clean and unclean; in removing and making atonement for things polluted or prescribed: and under these ceremonies, as under a veil or covering, a meaning the most important and sacred is concealed, as would be apparent from the nature of them, even if we had not, besides, other clear and explicit authority for this opinion. Among the rest are certain diseases and infirmities of the body. * * * The sacred poets sometimes have recourse to these topics for imagery, even on the most momentous occasions, when they display the general depravity inherent in the human mind (Isa. lxiv. 6), or exprobate the corrupt manners of their own people (Isa. i. 5, 6, 16; Ez. xxxvi. 17), or when they deplore the abject state of the virgin, the daughter of Sion, polluted and exposed (Lam. i. 8, 9, 17; ii. 2). If we consider these metaphors without any reference to the religion of their authors, they will doubtless appear in some degree disgusting and inelegant; if we refer them to their genuine source, to the peculiar rites of the Hebrews, they will be found wanting neither in force nor in dignity." LOWTH: *Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, Lec. VIII.*]

18. Ver. 9. **She remembereth not her last end.**—"It is a peculiarity of sin, that while it may rest a long time in a man's heart without disturbing him, yet whenever God begins to show His wrath, it wakes up and stings as a serpent and makes a wound that no one can heal (Ecclesiasticus xxi. 2). It would be well for us to reflect, when the devil makes sin as sweet as honey, that there may be poison concealed in it." CRAMER by EG. HUNXIN (Ser. III., p. 27). ["My son, hast thou sinned? Do so no more, but ask pardon for thy former sins. Flee from sin as from the face of a serpent; for if thou comest too near it, it will bite thee: the teeth thereof are as the teeth of a lion, slaying the souls of men. All iniquity is as a two-edged sword, the wounds whereof cannot be healed." Ecclesiasticus xxi. 1-3.]

19. Ver. 10. "If we have failed to keep diligently the gates of our heart and through some one of our senses lying open the old enemy have found entrance, he advances thence by means of depraved suggestions and illicit lusts into the very sanctuary of our soul, where the Holy Trinity used to dwell by means of true faith, and he despoils that sanctuary of the wisdom and virtues that beautify and embellish it, and we become miserable and most deserving of being overwhelmed with shame." RHABAN. MAURUS by GUISLER. p. 36.

20. Vers. 8-10. "Not the person, but the doctrine sanctifies a place, much less can a place sanctify the person and the doctrine. To which is pertinent that saying of JEROME in his Epistle to Heliodorus,—'It is not easy to stand in the place of Paul and to hold the rank of Peter, both of whom reign with Christ.' Whence it is said,—'They are not the sons of the saints who occupy the places of the saints, but those who do their works.' Wherefore if Jerusalem, the holiest of

all cities in the judgment of God Himself, is nevertheless declared in our text to be the wickedest of all cities, who will not rather say this of the city of Rome, which to-day, all the world knows, is the abyss of superstitions and of all possible abominations." FÖRSTER.

21. Ver. 11. **See, O Lord, and consider: for I am become vile.**—"The righteous are oppressed in the church that they may cry out, they cry that they may be heard, they are heard that they may glorify God." AUGUSTIN by FÖRSTER. [CALVIN: "We said yesterday, that the complaints which humbled the faithful, and, at the same time, raised them to a good hope, and also opened the door to prayers, were dictated by the Spirit of God. Otherwise, when men indulge in grief, and torment themselves, they become exasperated; and then to be kindled by this irritation is a kind of madness. The Prophet, therefore, in order to moderate the intensity of sorrow, and the raging of impatience, recalls again the faithful to prayer. And when Jerusalem asks God to see and to look, there is an emphasis intended in using the two words; and the reason given does also more fully show this, because she had become *vile*; so that the church set nothing else before God, to turn Him to mercy, but her own miseries. She did not, then, bring forward her own services, but only deplored her own miseries, in order that she might obtain the favor of God."]

22. [Ver. 12. **Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto Me.**—HENRY: "She justly demands a share in the pity and compassion of spectators. How pathetically does she beg their compassion! ver. 18. This is like that of Job, xix. 21. *Have pity, have pity upon me, O ye my friends!* It helps to make a burden sit lighter, if our friends sympathize with us, and mingle their tears with ours; for this evinces that, though in affliction, we are not in contempt, commonly as much dreaded as anything in an affliction."]

23. Ver. 12. "This is allegorically expounded to be the voice of Christ hanging on the cross, or of souls in Purgatory. * * * Or it is the voice of the church in tribulation. * * * Of the same nature is the anguish of the mother when in labor, or mourning her dead children, or dreading separation from her husband, or carried captive with her children among enemies. * * * It is the voice of the truly penitent soul, for there is no greater desolation than separation from God." BONAVENTURA by GHISLER. pp. 41, 42.

24. [Ver. 12. HENDERSON: "The words of this verse have been very generally applied, in the language of the pulpit, to the sufferings of our Saviour, and unquestionably they graphically describe the intensity of those sufferings; but considering the extent to which the original sense of the passage has been lost sight of, and the accommodated one substituted in its room, it would be well to notify that the secondary meaning is merely an accommodation of the words." WORDSWORTH: "This sorrowful exclamation may, in a secondary and spiritual sense, be regarded as coming from the lips of CHRIST on the cross, bewailing the sins and miseries of the world, which caused Him that bitter anguish,

of which alone it could be properly said, 'that no sorrow was like unto His sorrow.'" Thus GEORGE HERBERT, in "The Sacrifice:"

"Oh all ye, who pass by, whose eyes and mind
To worldly things are sharp, but to Me blind,
To Me, who took eyes that I might you find:
Was ever grief like Mine?"

* * * * *
But now I die; now all is finished.
My wo, man's weal; and now I bow My head:
Only let others say, when I am dead,
Never was grief like Mine."—W. H. H.]

25. Ver. 12. "Our Saviour could have used this apostrophe on the day of the preparation for the Passover, which might without impropriety be called, in the very words of this text, the day of the wrath and indignation of the Lord, inasmuch as on that day He poured out His wrath as if by a sudden impulse, on His own Son, in accordance with the testimony of Isa. liii. Speaking briefly: the suffering of Christ was infinite and infernal in regard to its atrocity, though not with regard to its duration; and this should be urged in refutation of the frivolous, carping objection of the disciples of Photinus, who with most impious sophistry assert, that the passion of Christ, because not eternal, could not be expiatory of sins which are infinite in guilt. Preachers ought to and can, by means of this prophetic exhortation, stimulate their hearers to more attentive meditation on the Lord's passion." FÖRSTER.

26. Ver. 12. "Zion's sorrow exceeds all other sorrow, for Zion is fully sensible of the nature of her sin,—which is the sin of a horrible rebellion against God Himself:—and, at the same time, she feels for the lost sinners, who were called by her word and whom she could have wished to see not lost. Zion's sorrow is fulfilled and completely realized in Jesus Christ, of Him have the prophets, and all saints, and all who are His, interpreted it,—these know only Christ. He who inflicts the sorrow is God the Father, and He who bears it, in the fullest sense, is the Son of God." DIEDRICH.

27. [Ver. 13. POOL: "The holy man owneth God as the first cause of all the evil they suffered, and entitles God to their various kinds of afflictions, both in captivity and during the siege, looking beyond the Babylonians, who were the proximate instrumental cause."]

28. Ver. 14. "Although it may have the appearance of wrath, that God should punish the Jewish people so severely with servitude, famine, disgrace and the contempt of their enemies, yet thereby God promoted their eternal benefit, since many of them were brought by these means to a knowledge of their sins they had not otherwise attained. Moreover, God does many a 'strange work' (Isa. xxviii. 21), in reference to that which He esteems His own. Example, MANASSEH." CRAMER by EG. HUNNIUS (*Ser.* III., pp. 28, 29).—"Oh! how salutary is the blow, when God punishes a man for his sins here in this life, and by such temporal punishment preserves him from the future eternal and terrible wrath of God and from unquenchable Hell-fire! Thus that holy teacher AUGUSTIN speaks, in his Confessions: Lord, burn me here, saw me in pieces here, pierce me here, stone me here. Only spare me in that world." EG. HUNNIUS, *id. loc.*

29. Ver. 14. "Punishment daily increases because guilt increases daily. AUGUSTIN. Sins because they excite the wrath of God, which is an intolerable burden (Prayer of MANASS., ver. 5), are themselves well called, and are, a yoke and an intolerable burden (Ps. xxxviii. 4; lxx. 4)." FÖRSTER. ["My transgressions, O Lord, are multiplied: My transgressions are multiplied, and I am not worthy to behold and see the height of Heaven, for the multitude of mine iniquities. *I am bowed down with many iron bands, that I cannot lift up mine head, neither have any release: for I have provoked Thy wrath, and done evil before Thee: I did not Thy will, neither kept I Thy commandments: I have set up abominations, and have multiplied offences.*" (The Prayer of MANASSEH.)—HENRY: "We never are entangled in any yoke, but what is framed out of our own transgressions. The yoke of Christ's commands is an *easy yoke*, Matt. ix. 30; that of our own transgressions a heavy one: God is said to bind this yoke, and nothing but the hand of His pardoning mercy will unbind it."]

30. Vers. 12-15. "We should observe here, what is the real source of all tribulation and adversity on earth; namely, not blind chance, not celestial agencies, not men, who err in their opinions, or cause misfortunes through wantonness or malice: in these we may find a secondary cause, but the highest cause, which should be first and most considered, is God. The Lord, says Jeremiah, has filled me full of grief; He has sent from on high a fire into my bones; the Lord has so severely handled me that I am not able to rise up. The Lord Himself freely confesses all this and says, 'Is there evil in the city, which I, the Lord, have not done?' (Am. iii. 6). Therefore if we would escape evil, we must go to no one but God, and see to it that we are reconciled with Him in regard to our sins. *Würtemb.: Summar.*"—[SCOTT: "It may properly be inquired of all that pass by, whether the suffering of the people of God be nothing to them? If they have no thought of compassionating or attempting to alleviate their distresses, they may at least behold and be instructed: they may see in them the holiness of God, the evil of sin, the emptiness of forms, the fatal effects of hypocrisy and impiety: and they may take warning to flee from the wrath to come, by considering the temporal miseries to which sin exposes men in this world, 'For if the righteous scarcely are saved, where will the ungodly and profligate appear?' If the rod of correction be so terrible, what will the sword of vengeance be?—But whatever may be learned by viewing the desolations of Jerusalem, * * * far more may be learned from looking unto Jesus, and His sufferings and death. Does He not, as it were from the cross, call on every heedless mortal to attend to the scene? Does He not say, 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto My sorrow, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted Me, in the day of His fierce anger against the sins of those whom I came to seek and save? Is it nothing to you that I am here a sinless sufferer? That I, the well-beloved Son of the Father, am consumed by the fire of His wrath, and that My heart in the midst of my bowels is even as melting wax, and all my bones out of

joint, and that mine enemies stand staring on and insulting over Me? Is it nothing to you that the Father hath wreathed on My neck the yoke of man's transgressions, and laid on Me the iniquity of all His people?' I say, doth not our suffering Immanuel seem thus to address us? And does it not behoove us to consider, who this Sufferer was, what He suffered, and why He suffered at all? Here we may see the evil of sin, the honor of the law, and the justice of God, more than in all the other scenes that we have been contemplating: here we may learn the worth of our souls, the importance of eternal things, the vanity of the world, and the misery of fallen man. Here we may see the only foundation of our hope, and the source of our comfort and happiness. Here we may learn gratitude and patience, meekness and mercy, from the brightest example and the most endearing motives. Let then all our sorrows lead us to contemplate the cross of Christ, and to mark the way He took through sufferings and death to His glory; that we may be comforted under our trials, and cheerfully follow our Fore-runner, that where He is, there we may be also."]

31. [Ver. 16. **Because the Comforter that should relieve my soul is far from me.**—The church suffering for her actual sins becomes a type of the Saviour suffering for the sins of the church imputatively. Here we have another cry from the cross. "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani." My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Those who forsake God will be forsaken of Him, and those who are forsaken of God, will seek in vain for any other comforter, and will be left to cry out with tears and lamentations and 'spread forth their hands,' ver. 17, in vain, because 'there is none to comfort' them. The constant allusion to an absent Comforter in this Song, see vers. 2, 9, 16, 17, 21, is significant. There is nothing like it in the other Songs of Lamentation.—W. H. H.]

32. Ver. 17. **Zion spreadeth forth her hands, and there is none to comfort her.**—"She receives compensatory punishment, in that, having refused to hear Him, who stretched out His hands (Isa. lxxv. 2), and to seek safety under His wings (Matt. xxiii. 37), she herself should afterwards stretch out her hands and not find a comforter." AMBROSE by GHSLER. p. 53.—"The ancient church (Sion) *spreadeth forth her hands*, i. e., her legal works and carnal righteousnesses, but *there is none to comfort her* on account of those works, for the Lord does not justify her through them. But what [is the result of this exhibition of her good works]? If she expects to be justified by *spreading out her hands* after this fashion, *God hath commanded that her adversaries*, i. e., her sins, *should be round about her*, and her sins are much more numerous, nay without comparison, innumerable, and her thousand justifications are as if she were an *unclean woman*, as a prophet elsewhere testifies, when he says: 'But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags' (Isa. lxxiv. 6)." RUPERTUS ABBAS by GHSLER. p. 54.

33. Ver. 18. "It is an ingenious and considerate method of discipline, when the good God would make us better and wiser, not by words, but by examples in other persons. Happy are

they, who become wise thus by the misfortunes of others." CRAMER.—**The Lord is righteous.** "Here recurs a common saying, to which the church bears her most illustrious testimony, in the same way as Mauritius the General, when about to be beheaded, is said to have pronounced publicly these words from Ps. cxix: 'Just art Thou, O Lord, and just are Thy judgments.' FÖRSTER. [The Mauritius referred to is Mauritius Tiberius, sometimes called St. Maurice, though not the Saint usually so designated. Before he himself was beheaded, his five sons were massacred before his eyes; "and Maurice, humbling himself under the hand of God, was heard to exclaim, 'Thou art just, O Lord, and Thy judgments are relieved from partiality.'" (*Encyc. Brit.*)—W. H. H.]

34. Ver. 19. **I called for my lovers, but they deceived me.**—"Under God's judgments we first learn, how foolish it was ever to have expected anything good from the world, to which we paid our earliest court, as Judah to Egypt, and from the Princes of the world. *They have betrayed me*, is ever said of all nations, whenever the church has relied upon the great ones of a nation as such. The world is the church's field, which bears thistles and thorns. Those who trust to the world must come eventually to beggary, and thus miserably prolong their lives; whereby they may possibly recover their senses." DIEDRICH.

35. Vers. 20-22. "Here the question occurs, whether we may pray against our enemies, since Christ says, 'Love your enemies' (Matt. v. 44)? Answer: There are two kinds of enemies. Some, who bear ill-will towards us personally for private reasons, concern ourselves alone. When the matter extends no further than to our own person, then should we privately commend it to God, and pray for those who are ill-disposed towards us, that God would bring them to a sense of their sin; and, besides, we ought, according to the injunction of Christ, to do them good, and not return evil for evil, but rather overcome evil with good (Rom. xii. 17, 21). But if our enemies are of that sort, that they bear ill-will to wards us, not for any private cause, but on account of matters of faith; and are also opposed, not only to us, but especially to God in Heaven, are fighting against His holy Word and are striving with eager impiety to destroy the Christian church;—then indeed should we pray that God would convert those who may be converted, but as for those who continue ever to rage, stubbornly and maliciously, against God and His church, that God would execute upon them according to His own sentence judgment and righteousness (Ps. cxxxix. 19)." CRAMER by EG. HUNNIUS (*Ser.* III., p. 36).

36. Ver. 20. [**Behold, O Lord.**—CALVIN: "The people turn again to pray to God: and what has been before said ought to be remembered, that these lamentations of Jeremiah differ from the complaints of the ungodly; because the faithful first acknowledge that they are justly chastised by God's hand, and secondly, they trust in His mercy and implore His aid. For by these two marks the church is distinguished from the unbelieving, even by repentance and faith."]—**For I am in distress.** "Such is the distress which arises from a disturbed conscience,

of which AMBROSIVS says (Lib. I., ep. 18), There is no greater pain than that which wounds the conscience with the sting of sin." FÖRSTER.—[**Abroad the sword bereaveth, at home there is as death.** HUGH BROUGHTON: "Deut. xxxii. They shall be brent with hunger and eaten up with burning and bitter destruction: without, the sword shall rot; within shall be fear. St. Paul, 2 Cor. vii. 5, calleth Moses and Jeremy both into mind, saying when we came into Macedonia my flesh had no rest, we were always in distress, without was fighting, within was fear. Thus divinely honoreth he the Songs of Moses and Jeremy, as having their words still before him, joining Moses' prophecy with Jeremy's story, and showing how the Apostles were vexed in the world, as Jerusalem of the Chaldeans."]

37. Ver. 21. **Thou hast done it.**—"It is most worthy of observation, that the church in this prayer having turned towards God openly declares, *Thou hast done it*. Whence it is plainly to be inferred that all calamities are sent by God (*θεόπεμπτου*)." FÖRSTER.

38. Vers. 21, 22. "O that God would let this day come soon, in which the discipline of His children has an end and the flames of God's wrath shall consume the rods of His chastisement forever! Then, in truth, our sins and the Devil will be once for all under our feet, and the whole world, which now vexes us, will descend into the abyss with howling and shrieks. In the heart of the Prophet, speaks also the Christ, who judges the world and will make it His footstool: and if we are really Christians, then we have, at the same time and in full measure, both sorrows and confidence; yet often the sense of sorrow exceeds, so that we say, *my sighs are many and my heart is faint*. But these sighs will be turned into joy (John xvi. 20-22), for they are the birththroes of the new life and of the eternal world. Happy is he who has a part therein." DIEDRICH.

39. Ver. 22. "Although our prayer is not a work of merit on account of which God should hear us, yet it is a means by which we are heard (Matt. vii. 7)." CRAMER.—[CALVIN: "We, in short, see that the faithful lay humbly their prayers before God, and at the same time confess that what they had deserved was rendered to them, only they set before God their extreme sorrow, straits, griefs, tears, and sighs. Then the way of pacifying God is, sincerely to confess that we are justly visited by His judgment, and also to lie down as it were confounded, and at the same time to venture to look up to Him, and to rely on His mercy with confidence."—HUGH BROUGHTON: "The first alphabet row is ended in the prophecy of ending the wicked kingdoms which should be brought under Babel's yoke, to show that all these troubles are in God's Providence settled in the most exquisite order for His judgments."]

40. [PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that as Thou hast hitherto dealt so mercifully with us, we may anticipate Thy dreadful judgment; and that if Thou shouldst more severely chastise us, we may not yet fail, but that being humbled under Thy mighty hand, we may flee to Thy mercy and cherish this hope in our hearts, that Thou wilt be a Father to us, and not hesitate to call

continually on Thee, until, being freed from all evils, we shall at length be gathered into Thy celestial kingdom, which Thine only-begotten Son has procured for us by His own blood. Amen." CALVIN.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. Vers. 1-11. On a fast-day, a church consecration, a festival in commemoration of the Reformation, at a Synod, or on similar occasions prompting to earnest warning, the congregation could be instructed, on the ground of this text, that *the judgment which befell the Old Testament Zion by means of the Chaldeans is a warning example to the New Testament Zion*. In doing so, it would be proper to consider: 1. The original glory of the Old Testament Zion, ver. 7 a. 2. Her presumptuous security and temerity, ver. 9 a. 3. The wickedness that became prevalent in consequence thereof, vers. 5 b, 8 a. 4. The judgment of God, for that wickedness, in its details; intrusion of enemies, ver. 10, desolation of the city, ver. 1, captivity of the people and of the Priests and Princes, vers. 3-6, discontinuance of public worship, ver. 10, famine, ver. 11, triumph of enemies, vers. 5, 7, 9, disgrace and misery of the people, vers. 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9. 5. The inference to be drawn from all this for our benefit; how that which happened to them may also happen to us, (Luke xxiii. 31; Rom. xi. 21-23; Rev. ii. 5).

2. Ver. 12. A sermon of consolation, on the occasion of a death, or other great misfortune. Our text suggests *remedies for great pain*. These are—1. Of a natural kind. 1. The sympathy of all men: 'I say to you all, etc., look and see, etc.' 2. Comparison with the pain of others: "see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow,"—where we are warned against the error of supposing our pain the greatest that ever was,

and are reminded that some are more unfortunate than ourselves. II. Of a spiritual kind. 1. The Lord has inflicted the wounds. 2. The Lord will heal them. [Consider, here, especially the active sympathy of Christ. To the question 'Was ever any sorrow like unto my sorrow!' we may answer, 'Yes, Christ's, and greater, too?' If "His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men," it was because, *more than any man*, He was "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." He bore the whole burden of our guilt and He suffered its full penalty. "The Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all," and 'He bore our griefs and carried our sorrows.' Why? Not only in the way of atonement, but that He might be a merciful High Priest, to sympathize with us and to help us. See Heb. ii. 17, 18; iv. 15, 16.—W. H. H.]

3. Vers. 12-22. A sermon on penitence; when a calamity, that may properly be considered as a Divine chastisement, calls for repentance. Subject: *The calamity, which has befallen us, considered in the light of Divine righteousness and love*. I. It proceeds from Divine righteousness. 1. Not another, but the Lord, has ordained it against us, vers. 14, 15. 2. It corresponds exactly to what we have deserved, vers. 14, 18. II. It proceeds from Divine love. 1. It admonishes us to sincere repentance. 2. It dissuades us from confiding in any false hope or support, vers. 13-16, 21. 3. It incites us to seek help from God in a believing spirit, ver. 20.

4. Ver. 20. FLOREY—*Biblical Guide* for spiritual funeral discourses, Leipzig, 1861, No. 385: "Well is it for a distressed widow, in her agony, to look to the Lord. For—1. The Lord *knows* thy pain, which He Himself has inflicted. 2. The Lord *soothes* thy pain, for He is the best Comforter. 3. The Lord *changes* thy pain, sooner or later, into a blessed experience of good."

CHAPTER II.

LAMENTATION OF THE POET OVER THE DESTRUCTION OF ZION: [THE DESTRUCTION DESCRIBED AND ATTRIBUTED TO JEHOVAH.—W. H. H.]

[*"The first song expresses sorrow over the disgrace of the city: the second describes the terrors of the destruction of the city and Temple"* (GERLACH, *Intr.*, p. 5), and connects them with the vengeance of God. In the first song, *the city* is the conspicuous object, and Zion and the holy places appear as accessories to her former honor and her present disgrace. In the second song, God's personal agency in the calamities described is the controlling idea (see vers. 1-9, 17, 20-22), and the Temple or Zion, as the place of His habitation, is the prominent object, while the city appears only as the locality or scene of Zion's former glory and the present cause of her deepest distress. The first words in each suggest the theme of each:—*"How doth the city sit solitary! How hath the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in His wrath!"**—The chapter is composed of two sections: 1. vers. 1-10, a description of the judgment which the Lord had inflicted; 2. vers. 12-22, lamentations over this judgment. The similarity of the general structure of Songs i., ii., their division into two almost equal parts, the first chiefly descriptive, the second more strictly composed of lamentations, is an evidence that they were written by one author, and help to compose one complete and symmetrical poem.—W. H. H.]

PART I.

VERS. 1-10.

8 VER. 1. How doth the Lord cover with a cloud, in His anger,
The daughter of Zion!
He, from Heaven, hath cast down to the ground
The glory of Israel,
He remembered not His footstool.
In the day of His anger.

* [In an alphabetical poem, where attention is directed to the initial letters, it may not be without significance that in Songs i., ii., the initials of the first three words are similar, spelling נִצָּח, that may mean *hated, despised, or an enemy*. In i. the initials of the first four words of i. we have נִצָּח, *enmity*.—W. H. H.]

- 3 VER. 2. The Lord swallowed up and spared not
 All the habitations of Jacob :
 He demolished in His wrath
 The strongholds of the daughter of Judah :
 He cast down to the ground—He polluted
 The kingdom and its princes.
- 1 VER. 3. He broke in hot anger
 Every horn of Israel.
 He turned back His right hand
 Before the enemy.
 And He set Jacob on fire—
 As a flame of fire devoureth round about.
- 7 VER. 4. He bent His bow as an enemy :
 He stood—with His right hand as an adversary—
 And destroyed
 All the delights of the eye.
 In the tabernacle of the daughter of Zion
 He poured out, as fire, His fury.
- 7 VER. 5. The Lord became as an enemy :
 He swallowed up Israel ;
 He swallowed up all her palaces ;
 He destroyed all His strongholds :
 And increased in the daughter of Judah
 Mourning and lamentation.
- 1 VER. 6. And He laid waste as a garden His tabernacle :
 He abolished His appointed solemnities :
 Jehovah caused to be forgotten in Zion
 Appointed solemnities and Sabbath days :
 And rejected in His furious anger
 King and Priest.
- 3 VER. 7. The Lord cast away with disdain His altar,
 He abhorred His Sanctuary.
 He gave up into the enemy's hand
 The walls of her palaces.
 They shouted in Jehovah's house
 As on a day of appointed solemnity.
- 7 VER. 8. Jehovah purposed
 To destroy the wall of the daughter of Zion.
 He stretched out a line :
 He withdrew not His hand from devouring.
 Then He caused rampart and wall to mourn ;
 They languished together.
- 6 VER. 9. Her gates have sunk into the ground :
 He destroyed and broke her bars.
 Her King and her Princes among the Gentiles—
 There is no law !
 Her Prophets also
 Find no vision from Jehovah !
- 9 VER. 10. The elders of the daughter of Zion
 Sit on the ground,—they are silent,—
 They throw up dust upon their heads,
 They put on sackcloth.
 The virgins of Jerusalem
 Bow their heads to the ground.

ANALYSIS.

In this song, as in the preceding one, the alphabetical construction interferes with the succession of the several steps and parts of the great drama in their regular order; yet, on close examination, some regard to the arrangement of events, with reference to their nature and occurrence, is observable. There is given, first of all, a comprehensive survey of the whole work of destruction, vers. 1, 2. Then follows a brief recital of the events of the war, from its beginning to the capture of the city, vers. 3, 4. Then is described the complete destruction of the Temple, the houses and the walls, by Nebuzaradan, four weeks after the capture of the city (see Jer. lii. 13, 14), vers. 5-9 *a*. Thus far only the material objects of the destruction are spoken of. What follows relates the sufferings of the persons who were involved in the catastrophe. From ver. 9 *b* we learn the fate of the King, Princes and Prophets; in ver. 10 we see the elders and the virgins lamenting; in ver. 11 the Poet describes his own sufferings, etc. [NÆGELSBACH does not recognize the very obvious division of this chapter into two parts. GERLACH makes three sections, vers. 1-10, 11-19, 20-22.—The first part naturally divides itself into two equal sections: vers. 1-5 contain a general description of the punishment of Zion; vers. 6-10 relate particularly to the destruction of Zion itself.—W. H. H.]

II. VERS. 1, 2.

- 1 How hath the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger, and
2 cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel, and remembered not his footstool in the day of his anger! The Lord hath swallowed up all the habitations of Jacob, and hath not pitied; he hath thrown down in his wrath the strongholds of the daughter of Judah: he hath brought them down to the ground: he hath polluted the kingdom and the princes thereof.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 1.—עֶנֶב. From the verbal stem, עִנַּב, from which is עֶב, a cloud, only this single form occurs, and this is *ἄν. Aey*. [בְּאַפּוֹ. GERLACH: "not with wrath (EWALD), but in His wrath, as similar expressions at the close of this ver. and in vers. 2, 6, 21, 22, show."—אַרְנֵי. See *Intr. Add. Rem.* p. 32.]—הַשְּׁלִיךְ.—Only used in Hiph. and Hoph.; frequent in Jeremiah, vii. 15, 29; ix. 18; xli. 9, etc.—אַרְנֵי. Accusative of place, in answer to the question, *Whither?* 1 Sam. xxv. 23; 1 Kings i. 31; Is. xlix. 23; Amos ix. 9; Ob. 3; Ps. cxlvii. 15; my *Gr.*, § 70, *b*. Jeremiah uses אַרְנֵי as accusative after verbs of going and coming very frequently, xxxvii. 12; xl. 12; xlii. 14; xliii. 7, etc.—תַּפְאֲרָה. תַּפְאֲרָה, a corresponding word, is very frequent with Jeremiah, xlviii. 17; xlii. 11, 18; xxxiii. 9.—כָּבֹד, in same sense, Jer. xxxi. 20; xv. 15. כָּבֹד, not found in Jer.—Jeremiah never says יוֹם אֵף. The only place in which he connects אֵף with the idea of a particular time, he says בְּעֵת אֵפֶךְ, xviii. 23. The expression is found in Lam. only here and vers. 21, 22.

Ver. 2.—בִּלְעִי. Jeremiah uses only Kal, and that only once, li. 34. Piel in this chapter five times, vers. 2, 5, bis, 8, 16, nowhere else in Lam.—[אַרְנֵי. See *Intr. Add. Rem.* p. 32.]—לֹא חָמַל.—[Kri. וְלֹא. "The asyndeton is much used in this species of verse at the half pause." BLAYNEY.] Jeremiah uses the word חָמַל, xlii. 14; xv. 5; xxi. 7; i. 14; li. 3. But to express the thought, which לֹא חָמַל here represents, Jeremiah uses וְלֹא נָחַם, xx. 16. [With all deference, the thought in xx. 16 is only analogous to the thought here, which is exactly expressed in the passages first cited. This is not to be overlooked in considering the peculiarities of Jeremiah's style and language.—W. H. H.]—נְאוֹת יְעֻקֵּב.—נְאוֹת occurs only here. [BLAYNEY translates נְאוֹת pleasant places, following the Sept., πάντα τὰ ὡπαία, and the Latin, omnia speciosa. DOUAY: all that was beautiful in Jacob. Though נְאוֹת is used in this sense in the Piel, there is no clear case where the noun has this sense; it designates either dwellings, Ps. lxxix. 20; lxxxiii. 13, or pasture-grounds regarded as the dwellings of shepherds and their flocks, Am. i. 2; Jer. ix. 9; xxv. 37; Ps. xliii. 2; lxx. 13. FUERST translates it here unprotected, open cities, opposite of walled and fortified places.—W. H. H.]—חֵסֶד. Jeremiah uses frequently, i. 10; xxiv. 6, xxxi. 28, etc.—He uses יְעֻכָּרָה only twice, vii. 29; xlviii. 30.—כִּנְצְרֵי בֵת-יְהוּדָה.—See Jer. i. 8; v. 17.—חָלַל, Piel, occurs in Jeremiah, xvi. 18; xxxi. 5; xxxiv. 16; comp. Is. xliii. 28.—מְלִכָּה וְשָׁרִי.—Sept. has βασιλεία αὐτῆς. They must have read מְלִכָּה as in ver. 9. The Syriac and Arabic read so also. Yet the authority of the Septuagint is much too precarious to change the reading of the text, which is also found in the Vulg. and Chal. Besides, it is much easier to explain how מְלִכָּה, at the time in sight at ver. 9, could originate from מְלִכָּה, than it would be to account for the reverse. מְלִכָּה in connection with שָׁרִי (the suffix of which refers to the former) and with reference to נְאוֹת, is without doubt to be taken in the sense of royalty=kingship, regia potestas. Jeremiah uses the word in this sense, xxvii. 1; xxviii. 1. [FUERST: dominion, reign, kingdom.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. How—see i. 1—hath the Lord covered—doth the Lord cover—the daughter of

Zion with a cloud in his anger. The Poet has evidently the image of a thunder-storm in his mind. The wrath of Jehovah envelops Zion in a cloud, out of which the destroying lightning (see next clause) descends upon her. [WORDS-

WORTH: "The Lord hath poured out His fury on Zion, as in a tempest, and has dashed down her beauty as with lightning, and has not spared the Ark of His Sanctuary." GERLACH: **in his wrath**. "The frequent repetition of this expression (see at the close of vers. 3, 6, 21, 22) shows that this chapter is especially intended to exhibit the fury of the wrath of God against Jerusalem; as in the first chapter the repetition of the formula, indicating the absence of help and comfort, corresponds to the description of the extreme distress described in that chapter." The expression **daughter of Zion** occurs i. 6, and Jeremiah iv. 31; vi. 2, 23.—**And cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel**. To understand this it is necessary to determine first of all to whom the words **from heaven** refer. At the first glance they seem to refer to the object of the verb **cast down**. In that case **the beauty of Israel** would be in Heaven and from Heaven hurled down to the earth. But in what sense was **the beauty of Israel** in Heaven? To answer this, we must first know what is meant by **the beauty** or **glory of Israel**. The word in the original הַפְּאִיִּת, by itself, could indicate the Temple which the Israelites called בֵּית הַפְּאִיִּת [lit., *house of our glory*; E. V., *our beautiful house*], Is. liv. 10; comp. lx. 7; lxiii. 15; or, the ark of the covenant, in reference to which the daughter-in-law of Eli gave to her child the name of Ichabod, which is thus interpreted (1 Sam. iv. 21, 22), "And she named the child Ichabod, [Marg.: where is the glory? or, there is no glory], saying, The glory is departed from Israel (because the ark of God was taken, and because of her father-in-law and her husband): and she said, The glory is departed from Israel; for the ark of God is taken." See Ps. lxxviii. 61. The word הַפְּאִיִּת is, however, in itself too abstract and general, and there is too little in the context to fix its definition, to allow us to say with confidence that it denotes in the concrete any particular object. We are obliged, therefore, to acquiesce in its general sense, and to understand by it the glory of Israel in general, especially all that distinguishes Israel as the chosen people before all peoples. All this is truly, by the destruction of the Theocracy, cast down to the ground. Should we now refer **from Heaven** to the object of the verb **cast down**, then we must take it figuratively, as expressing the height of the glory or **beauty of Israel**, which is thus denoted as towering up to Heaven. But Heaven שָׁמַיִם is never used in this figurative sense in the Old Testament. The places which are cited as proving such a use of the word (Gen. xi. 4; Job xx. 6; Isa. xiv. 12; Dan. iv. 8; 2 Chron. xxviii. 9; comp. Gen. iv. 10) are entirely irrelevant. In the New Testament only Matt. xi. 23; Luke x. 15 ("and thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto Heaven," etc.) afford possible analogies for such a figurative use of this phrase. Therefore I believe (with DATHE, KALKAR and others) that **from Heaven** is to be referred to the *subject* of the verb **cast down**: *the Lord from Heaven* casts down the glory of Israel to the ground. This also suits admirably the idea expressed in the verb in the first clause,

יָכַר = *to cover with a cloud*, under which the image of a thunder-storm is suggested. From the Heavens the Lord, by a stroke of lightning, casts down the glory of Israel. *From Heaven* מִשָּׁמַיִם is often used in this sense, Josh. x. 11; 2 Sam. xxii. 14; Gen. xix. 24; Ex. xvi. 4, etc.—**And remembered not His footstool in the day of His anger**. The ark of the covenant is explicitly called the footstool of Jehovah in 1 Chron. xxviii. 2, where David says, "I had in mine heart to build an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD and for the footstool of our God" [*and for the footstool*]. "The conjunction *and* is exegetical, and the same with *that is*." So says JOSEPH MEDE in his article on Ps. cxxxii. 7, "We will go into His tabernacle, we will worship at (*towards*, MEDE) His footstool."—W. H. H. J. The ark of the covenant may be so called, because He, who is enthroned upon the cherubim (2 Sam. vi. 2; Ps. lxxx. 2; xcix. 1) [see also 1 Sam. iv. 4, which MEDE translates *sitteth upon the cherubims*.—W. H. H. J.], has the cover of the ark of the covenant [the mercy-seat] at His feet, wherefore it is also said, that the Lord speaks

מֵעַל הַכִּסֵּא מִלְּפָנֶיךָ from above the mercy-seat, Ex. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89. Therefore, without doubt, the ark of the covenant is to be understood as the **footstool**, towards which worship is said to be directed in Ps. xcix. 5; cxxxii. 7. [ALEXANDER: on Ps. xcix. 5. "Exalt ye Jehovah our God, and prostrate yourselves to His footstool.—Bow down (or prostrate) yourselves, as an act of worship. Not at His footstool, as the mere place of worship, but to it, as the object, this name being constantly given to the ark, 1 Chron. xxviii. 2; Lam. ii. 1; Ps. cxxxii. 7; Isa. lx. 13. Even in Isa. lxvi. 1, there is allusion to the ordinary usage of the terms. The ark is here represented as the object of worship, just as Zion is in Isa. xlv. 14, both being put for the God who was present in them." CALVIN: "The design of the Prophet is to show to the people how much God's wrath had been kindled, when He spared not even His own sanctuary. For he takes this principle as granted, that God is never without reason angry, and never exceeds the due measure of punishment. As, then, God's wrath was so great that He destroyed His own Temple, it was a token of dreadful wrath. * * He (the prophet) could not have better expressed to the people the heinousness of their sins, than by laying before them this fact, that God remembered not His footstool in the day of His anger."—The three members of the verse are so related to each other, that the first exhibits Zion as completely enveloped as it were in a thunder cloud, the second represents the glory of Israel as destroyed by the lightning, the third dwells especially on the fact, that the Lord had not so much as spared the holiest of holy things, the ark of the covenant.

[יָכַר]. NAEGLSACH translates it *verdunkelt*; GERLACH, *umwölkt*; HUGH BROUGHTON, *beclouded*.—OWEN, in a note to his translation of CALVIN, observes that this verb is clearly in the future tense, and proposes to translate it, "Why should the Lord in His wrath becloud the daughter of Zion?" "Then follows," he says, "a description of what had happened to Zion, He hath cast

from Heaven," etc. SCOTT seems to take the same view of the expostulatory character of the sentence, when he says, the prophet "inquires, with mingled surprise and regret, how the Lord, the Author of her afflictions, could be induced thus to distress her?" But it is better to take the verb in the sense of the present, *How doth the Lord cover, etc.*, as BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, NAEGELSACH and GERLACH. The Poet "assumes an ideal point of vision prior to" the actual occurrence of the event, "and so regards it as future." Yet while he speaks, the thing is done; and the description is completed in the past tense. The future as thus used in Hebrew, is best translated by the present in English. See GREEN'S *Gr.*, § 263, 5. "The intermingling of different tenses in relation to the same subject, which is so frequent in poetry, foreign as it may be to our modes of thought, does not justify the conclusion that they are used promiscuously or without regard to their distinctive signification" (*Ib.* note "a."). If we accept NAEGELSACH's idea of the thunder-cloud and the lightning, the use of the future in the first verb is very forcible. The Poet sees the cloud gathering, and while he looks, the lightning has flashed and the work of destruction is complete.—ABEN-EZRA, according to ROSENUELLER, see also CALVIN, explains the word to mean *lifted up to the clouds*. God exalted the daughter of Zion to the clouds, "in His wrath," that He might cast her down from a greater height. "For when one wishes to break in pieces an earthen vessel, he not only casts it on the ground, but he raises it up, that it may be thrown down with greater force" (CALVIN). We need some evidence better than this ingenious argument that the word can have this meaning.—The Chald. and Syr., GESENIUS in his *Thes.*, MAURER and J. D. MICHAELIS translate the word *sprevit, contumelia vel opprobrio affecit, dishonored, disgraced*, finding for this sense an analogy in the Arabic. The principal argument for this is, that he who is thrown down from Heaven is not surrounded with clouds. We answer 1. According to NAEGELSACH above, "from Heaven" refers to the subject and not to the object of the verb "cast down." 2. The figure of the thunder-cloud implies rather that the cloud covered the doomed City and Temple, and not that they were lifted up into the clouds. 3. There are two subjects expressed, as well as two verbs. Not *the daughter of Zion*, but *the glory of Israel* is cast down to the ground.—GERLACH gives a poetical explanation to the first two clauses, "Jerusalem is compared to a star, that once shone brightly, but was first clouded over and then thrown to the earth;" and seems to imagine an allusion to Isa. xiv. 12. But his beautiful star shines only in his fancy, and not in the text.

Ver. 2. **The Lord hath swallowed up.**—The Poet has in mind the idea of a yawning abyss. See Ex. xv. 12; Num. xvi. 30-32; xxvi. 10; Deut. xi. 6; Ps. cvi. 17. [All the English versions translate the verb *swallowed up*, except HENDERSON (*destroyed*) and the Douay (*The Lord hath cast down headlong, from Vulgate, precipitavit*).

Yet it seems manifest, from the use of the same word in vers. 5, 8, 16 (see also Hab. i. 13; Isa. xxv. 7, 8; xlix. 19; 2 Sam. xx. 19), that the word is used merely to signify utter destruction, without intending to suggest, even in a figurative sense, the exact method of destruction, as by such "a yawning abyss" as is referred to in passages cited by NAEGELSACH. GERLACH has *destroyed, vertilgt*, CALVIN also, *perdidit*.—W. H. H.]—**All the habitations of Jacob.** The word rendered *habitations* includes the ideas of dwellings and pasture-grounds. It indicates the places where the Nomadic spread his tent and allowed his flock to graze. Hence the frequent phrase נֶאֱוָת כֶּהֱנִי [lit. *dwellings of pasture-land*], Ps. lxxv. 13; Jer. ix. 9; xxiii. 10; Joel i. 19, 20; ii. 22. **And hath not pitied.** See vers. 17, 21; iii. 43. And spared not. [So the Sept. and Vulg. E. V. *pitied*, is most in accordance with the use of the word: yet the idea of *sparing*, in the exercise of mercy, is suggested by the order of the words in the original, The Lord swallowed up and spared not all the habitations of Jacob. So CALVIN, BROUGHTON, GERLACH.—W. H. H.]—**He hath thrown down—demolished, in His wrath the strongholds of the daughter of Judah.** The strongholds of Judah stand in antithesis to the habitations of Jacob; not only the open unprotected places, where the people dwelt among their pasture and grazing lands, but also the fortified cities were visited with destruction.—The daughter of Judah, see i. 15; ii. 5. The expression is very suitable, since only Judah still had any strongholds. See Jer. xxiv. 7.—**He hath brought them down to the ground: He hath polluted the kingdom and the princes thereof.** *He cast down to the ground, He polluted the kingdom and its princes.* The expression הֵרַס לְאֶרֶץ, to bring down to the ground, is used very explicitly of fortified places in Isa. xxv. 12; xxvi. 5, comp. Ezek. xiii. 14. Yet to refer it here to what precedes, results in a troublesome asyndeton. Then, too, the structure of the verse would be irregular, for the second idea and clause of the verse would have three lines or members, and the third only one. Finally, there is an idea in *bringing down to the ground* [or made to touch the ground; margin, E. V.], akin to that of *pollution*, which immediately follows. For majesty is polluted by being brought into contact with common dust. Compare Ps. lxxxix. 40, חָלַלְתָּ לְאֶרֶץ נִרְוֹ, "Thou hast profaned his crown, by casting it to the ground." [In favor of NAEGELSACH's construction is 1. the absence of the conjunction. 2. The prevailing meaning of the verb נָגַע followed by לְ, to touch, to come in contact with. 3. The natural division of the verse. 4. The excellent sense. This construction is adopted by ROSENUELLER, EWALD, NEUMANN, BLAYNEY and NOYES. The only objections to it are 1, the application of the phrase *brought down to the ground*, in Isaiah, to the razing of fortified places; and 2, which is a stronger objection, the Masoretic punctuation.—W. H. H.]

II. 3, 4.

- 3 He hath cut off in *his* fierce anger all the horn of Israel: he hath drawn back his right hand from before the enemy, and he burned against Jacob like a flaming
4 fire, *which* devoureth round about. He hath bent his bow like an enemy: he stood with his right hand as an adversary, and slew all *that were* pleasant to the eye in the tabernacle of the daughter of Zion: he poured out his fury like fire.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 3.—**וַיִּדַע**. Only the Niph. is found in Jer., xlviii. 25; 1. 23.—**חַר־אַף**, not in Jeremiah.—**לְהַכָּה**, Jer. xlviii. 45.—**אֶכְלָה כְּבִיבִים**, see Jer. xxi. 14; xlv. 14; 1. 32. Jeremiah always employs **אֶכְלָה** as the object of **אֶכְלָה** in this sense, **כְּבִיבִים** or **כְּבִיבוֹת**.

Ver. 4.—**קָשֶׁת־רַרְךָ**, Jer. ix. 2; xlv. 9; 1. 14, 29; li. 3.—There is no sufficient reason for questioning the pointing of **רַרְךָ** as Part. Niph. It is in apposition with **נָצַב**, [**נָצַב**] is used of God's coming in judgment in Isa. iii. 13; Ps. lxxxii. 1. Its close connection by **וְ** with the next verb should not be unobserved. *He stood or set Himself—His right hand as an adversary—and slew, etc.*—W. H. II.] Jeremiah never uses the Niph. **נָצַב**, only the Hiph., v. 26; xxxi. 21, and Hithp., xlv. 4, 14.—The verb **הָרַן** (see Lam. ii. 20, 21; iii. 43), is scarcely current with Jeremiah. He uses only the Part. (xxx. 21) and Inf. Kal. (xv. 3). [LOWTH, *Prelim. Dissert. on Isaiah*, and BLAYNEY supply after this verb **כָּל־נוֹעַר**, every youth, from the Chaldee Paraphrase, to supply an apparent defect in metre.—W. H. II.]—The expression **אֵהָל פֶּתַח** occurs only here.—[The recurrence in Jeremiah of the figures of *bending the bow* and of *pouring out fury as liquid fire* (see Jer. iv. 4; vii. 20; xxi. 12; xlii. 18; xlv. 6) may be regarded as evidences of authorship.—W. H. II.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 3, 4. When it is here said that the Lord had broken the horn of Israel, then that He had deprived him of his right hand, then that He had kindled a fire in Jacob, and as an enemy had assaulted him, it is evident that a climax is intended. There is described first the deprivation of the power of resistance, then the deprivation of help, then the progress to positive hostility. THENIUS sees in vers. 3, 4 a full statement of all the incidents of the war, from the capture of the frontier fortresses to the taking of the city by storm. He understands, therefore, by the *horn of Israel*, “those places of defence which were prominent, like horns, consequently frontier fortresses;” *hath drawn back his right hand, etc.* describes the retreat of the Jewish armies to the capital; *he burned against Jacob, etc.*, the effusion of the hostile troops over the land of which they were to become masters; *he hath bent his bow, etc.*, the institution of siege; *he stood with his right hand, etc.*, and *slew, etc.*, the assault and storming of the city; *he poured out his fury like fire*, the capture of the city. Some of this hits the true sense, but not all. That *horn* should indicate the frontier fortresses, is artificial. It is to be considered, too, that the phrase is **כָּל־קַרְן**, *all the horn* [it may mean, however, *every horn*: the absence of the article makes this sense most probable.—W. H. II.] *To draw back the bow* would not indicate the first attack of the city, for that attack was not made with arrows only. *To stand with the right hand as an adversary* does not mean to begin to fight with the right hand, and does not therefore describe an exclusively hand to hand fight. Certainly, as already remarked, the description advances from merely negative to directly positive hostility, but the latter is described, not by the successive steps of the siege,

but according to the various and—as far as practicable—simultaneous events of the achievement, wherein the most impressive event, representing, of course, the end, is placed last of all.

Ver. 3. **He hath cut off—He broke—in his fierce anger—in hot anger.** See Ex. xi. 8; Deut. xxix. 23; 1s. vii. 4; 1 Sam. xx. 34; 2 Chron. xxv. 10. [The pronoun *his* supplied in E. V. is unnecessary, and weakens the sense. There is a rhetorical climax in the words—*anger*, **אַף**, ver. 1; *wrath*, **עֵבֶרָה**, ver. 2; and *heat of anger*, or hot, fierce, furious anger, **חַר־אַף**, ver. 3.—W. H. H.]—**All the horn of Israel—Every horn of Israel.** See Jer. xlviii. 25; Ps. lxxv. 11. According to constant usage, the horn is a symbol of power; see Ps. xviii. 3; lxxv. 5, 6, etc. [CALVIN: “We know that by *horn* is meant strength as well as excellency or dignity; and I am disposed to include both here, though the word breaking seems rather to refer to strength or power.” NOYES: “every horn, i. e., all her means of defence.”]—**He hath drawn back—He bent back—his right hand from before the enemy.** Does the pronominal suffix *his*, in **יְמִינוֹ**, *his hand*, refer to Jehovah, or to Israel? Grammatically either is possible, and the sense in either case is substantially the same. The answer must depend on which interpretation best agrees with the usage of speech. The expression in full, as it is here, is found nowhere else in the Old Testament. It is worthy of remark that Jeremiah never uses **יְמִינוֹ**=*right hand*, in a figurative sense. The word occurs in his book only once, xxii. 24, and then in its literal sense. The only places that can be adduced as parallel to this place are, on the one side, Ps. lxxiv. 11 (with reference, perhaps, to the expression **יָדוֹ נְטוּיָה**—*a stretched-out arm*, Ex. vi. 6, and elsewhere), and on the other side, Ps. xlv. 11; lxxxix. 43, 44; comp. 1s. xli. 13

Whilst the first named passage distinctly expresses the thought that Jehovah draws back His hand, and that His right hand, the other passages declare that the Lord let the people or the edge of the sword fall back from before their enemy. It seems to me that in our passage the word *חָוֹר*, *back, backward*, standing in connection with *כִּפְּנֵי הָאֹיֵב*, *before the enemy*, decides for the latter meaning. For in Ps. lxxiv. 11 it is merely *חָוֹר*, *thou withdrawest thy hand*. Here the *חָוֹר*, *backward*, must change the sense. Drawing back the hand is merely the opposite of stretching it out (*וְיָרֵץ וְנִטְרָה*) and an act of volition consistent with the possession of strength. But falling back before the enemy is a symptom of weakness, which could not be asserted of the hand of Jehovah. As it is said elsewhere that Jehovah strengthens the right hand (Is. xli. 13), or elevates it (Ps. lxxxix. 43), so it can be said that He lets it fall back (as if it had become weak), and this falling back of the right hand is the same, as is elsewhere explained, as a falling back of the person generally (Ps. xlv. 11), or of the sword (held by the right hand, Ps. lxxxix. 44). [OWEN (in a note on CALVIN): "GATAKER, HENRY, BLAYNEY, and HENDERSON, consider the right hand as that of Israel—that God drew back or restrained the right hand of Israel, so that he had no power to face his enemies. But SCOTT agrees with CALVIN; and favorable to the same view are the early versions, except the *Syr.*, for they render the pronoun *his own, suam*; the *Targ.* also takes the same view. Had the word been *hand*, it might have been applied to Israel; but it is *the right hand*, which commonly means protection, or rather God's power, as put forth to defend His people and to resist enemies. This is farther confirmed by what is said in the following verse, that God stood with His right hand as an enemy. See Ps. lxxiv. 11." GATAKER's argument, in *Assembly's Annotations*, on the other side, is very strongly put, and agrees in its main points with NÄGELSBACH'S. Yet, for the following reasons, it seems necessary to stand by the versions and interpreters that refer the pronoun to God. 1. The pronoun usually belongs to the subject of the verb where its personal object is not specified. By adhering to this rule, we would often escape uncertainty and confusion. 2. After such an introduction as in ver. 1, *How hath the Lord done all this*, and the subsequent use of *His* with reference to God (ver. 1, *His anger, twice, His footstool*; ver. 2, *His wrath*; ver. 4, *His bow, His right hand, His fury, etc.*), it certainly seems arbitrary and violent in this instance to refer it to another subject. 3. It is awkward, to say the least, to make *his right hand* in ver. 3 mean one thing, and in ver. 4 another. 4. Throughout this whole passage, vers. 1-10, the people of Israel are represented as passive objects of Divine wrath, and no allusion is made to the slightest activity on their part in resisting the instruments of wrath, as would be done here if *his* refers to Israel. 5. This makes excellent sense, and preserves the continuity of the thought, verging as usual towards a climax. God breaks off the horn of Israel, that they can no longer oppose their enemies; He bends back

His own right hand, and thus withdraws His own opposition to those enemies; and while Israel lies thus helpless in themselves and deprived of God's help, He pours down upon them the fiery fury of His own wrath, and becomes Himself like an enemy fighting against them. The bending back of His hand may be intended to express God's resistance to His own merciful impulses towards His own people. He forcibly bends back the hand He had already stretched out in Israel's behalf.—W. H. H.]—**And he burned against Jacob like a flaming fire, which devoureth round about—And He set Jacob on fire, as a flame of fire which devours round about** [*i. e.*, He, as a flame of fire which consumes all around it, set Jacob on fire]. *פֶּעַר* with *בְּ* of the object is so often used in the signification of setting on fire, then of consuming by fire (Num. xi. 1, 3; Is. xxx. 33; xlii. 25; xliii. 2; Jer. xlv. 6; Job i. 16; Ps. cvi. 18), that we may take it here unhesitatingly in the same sense. This, indeed, is the only admissible sense. For should we take in *Jacob*, *בְּיַעֲקֹב*, in a local sense, we must still understand *פֶּעַר* of the kindling of the fire, in which sense only is the Piel used (comp. Ex. xxxv. 3; Jer. vii. 18; Ezek. xxi. 4). Then, too, we see the force of the particle of comparison, *כְּאֵשׁ*, like a flame. Evidently the meaning is that the Lord had become to Jacob as a flaming fire. He had become so by kindling the consuming fire of war in the land. See Deut. xxxii. 22.

Ver. 4. **He hath bent His bow like an enemy.** The Lord attacks Israel with all kinds of weapons: and so with the bow. Comp. Ps. vii. 13; Deut. xxxii. 23. [CALVIN: "Stating a part for the whole, he includes in the *bow* every other weapon." KITTO: "The Hebraism for *bow* is like that for *bread*. As the latter includes all food, so does the former include all weapons." (*Daily Bib. Ill.*, Vol. 3, p. 295).—**He stood with His right hand as an adversary.** He stood at his right hand as an adversary. We cannot take his right hand as the subject of the verb (*נִצָּת*)—*erecta est manus ejus instar hostis* (KALKAR) [*His right hand stood erect like an adversary*, BLAYNEY]—for neither does the verb mean to be erected, raised up, nor does its gender allow this construction. I think it also incorrect to take his right hand as the accusative of the instrument, as THENIUS, VAHINGER and others do. For to stand with the right hand as an adversary is an unusually odd expression, with no example to sustain it. EWALD would give to the verb *נִצָּת* the meaning of taking aim at something. [So HENDERSON: *He hath steadied His right hand like an adversary*. "The point of the comparison here is obviously that of the care taken by the archer to obtain a steady aim."] EWALD appeals to Ps. xi. 3, but the phraseology in that place is entirely different. I think that passages like Ps. cix. 6; Zech. iii. 1 illustrate this. In those places the enemy is represented as standing at the right hand. As it is said elsewhere that the friend and helper stands at the right hand, in order to support and strengthen the right hand (Ps. xvi. 8; lxxxiii. 23; cix. 31; cx. 5; cxxi. 5; Is. xli. 13), so it is also said that

the enemy places himself at the right hand, in order, by hemming it in and weakening it, to overcome its resistance. That יְמִינוֹ, *his right hand*, has to be taken as an accusative of place, is no objection (see my *Gr.*, § 70, c; Ex. xxxiii. 8), though elsewhere a preposition is used (see the places above referred to, Ps. cix. 6; Zech. iii. 1 and Ps. xlv. 10). [The ingenious reference of *his right hand* to Israel is peculiar to our author: though CHALDEUS, as quoted by ROSENUELLER, adopts a similar construction, but with reference to the enemies of Israel:—"He has placed Himself at the right hand of Nebuchadnezzar, in order to assist him." Besides the absence of the preposition which this interpretation would seem to require, a very strong objection to it is the sudden change of person. For the principal reasons for supposing the *right hand* in ver. 3 refers to God, because God is the subject of the preceding clause, and no other person is specified, we believe the *right hand* in ver. 4 also refers to God; if *his bow* means God's bow, and not Israel's, then *his right hand* would naturally mean God's, and not Israel's, or Nebuchadnezzar's, or any other person's. It is not necessary, however, to violate grammar by giving to the Niphal participle an active or perfect sense, as EWALD and others have done. We can translate literally thus: *He stood, or was standing, or set Himself—His right hand as an adversary*. The ellipsis is characteristic of Hebrew poetry, and may be supplied by *quoad*, as to, or exegetically *with*, as in our version: He stood *with* His right hand as

an adversary. WORDSWORTH: "The Prophet first has a general view of the awful form of the Almighty, and then beholds His *Right Hand* putting itself forth as an enemy against Zion." ROSENUELLER: "He has placed Himself as regards His right hand, as if with it He would hurl at me a javelin." See GERLACH also.—W. H. H.]—**And slew all that were pleasant to the eye—And destroyed all that charms or delights the eye.** The delights of the eye (see i. 7, 10, 11) are evidently those in whom the eyes of parents take the greatest delight, the *virgins* and the *young men*, i. 18. [CALVIN: *He slew all the chosen men*. It is better to take the verb הָרַג, *to kill, slay*, metaphorically, as in Ps. lxxviii. 47. for *destroy* (HENDERSON).—W. H. H.]—**In the tabernacle of the daughter of Zion.** If the daughter of Zion is the body of the inhabitants of Zion, then the tabernacle of the daughter of Zion is the dwelling-place of those inhabitants, i. e., the city. [These words are connected with what follows, not with the preceding clause: *In the tabernacle of the daughter of Zion poured He out like fire His fury*. So BLAYNEY, GERLACH, NAEGELSBACH. CALVIN prefers it. The Masoretic punctuation requires it.—W. H. H.]—**He poured out His fury like fire.** The figurative idea of the outpouring of wrath, conceived of as liquid fire, is found elsewhere in iv. 11; Hos. v. 10; Jer. vi. 11; x. 25; xlii. 18; comp. xiv. 16. That the Poet would indicate the capture and destruction of the city, is clear.

II. 5.

- 5 The LORD was as an enemy: he hath swallowed up Israel, he hath swallowed up all her palaces; he hath destroyed his strongholds, and hath increased in the daughter of Judah mourning and lamentation.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 5.—אֶרְמוֹן, in Lam. only here and ver. 7. Often in Jeremiah, vi. 5; ix. 20, etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

According to Jer. lii. 13, 14 (see also 6, 12), four weeks after the capture, Nebuzaradan had burned 'the house of Jehovah, the house of the king, all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great house,' and destroyed the walls. To these facts vers. 5-9 seem to refer, though they relate only to the destruction of the palaces, the holy places and the walls. [The particular description of destruction of holy places begins at ver. 6.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 5. **The Lord was as an enemy.** *The Lord became as an enemy.* This is specified, first of all, as the cause of these calamities. As an enemy, see ver. 4, and אֶלְמִנָּה as a widow, i. 1.—**He hath swallowed up** (see ver. 2) **Israel, He hath swallowed up all her palaces; He hath destroyed his strongholds.** *Israel*, on the one part, and the *palaces* and *strongholds*, on

the other, are to each other as the people and the city. *Palaces* here, as remarked, seem to correspond to "the king's house" and "all the houses of the great men," or "every great house,"

הַבָּיִת הַגָּדוֹל in Jer. lii. 13. *Strongholds*, see ver. 2.—**He hath destroyed his strongholds.** is a quotation from Jer. xlviii. 18. Commentators differ with respect to the suffixes in אֶרְמוֹנֶיהָ, *her palaces*, מְצָדָיו, *his strongholds*. Some think the feminine suffix *her* refers to the daughter of Zion, ver. 4, the masculine suffix *his* to Israel. Others think that Israel itself may be conceived of, at one time as the name of the country, at another as the name of the city. [This is the opinion of GERLACH, who refers to a very similar instance in Hos. viii. 14, where the feminine suffix is attached to the same word as here, אֶרְמוֹנֶיהָ, *her palaces*, and where, as here the masculine would be expected.—W. H. H.] J. D. MICHAELIS would read אֶרְמוֹנֵיהָ, *palaces of*

Jehovah. THENIUS conjectures that הָיָה , *her*, has been changed into הָיָה , *his*, by the omission of a stroke of the pen. But all the commentators, so far as I see, have overlooked the fact that the last words are a quotation. In this way we easily explain the masculine suffix, which not only disagrees with *her palaces*, but violates the rule by which, every where else in the Lamentations, Zion is conceived of as a female person. The word is either a very old scribal error for הָיָה , *thy strongholds* (yet the Sept. has $\tau\alpha \delta\epsilon\chi\rho\acute{o}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$), or the Poet has chosen the suffix that best preserved the similarity of sound with the original text. He could do this in virtue of the greater freedom which prevails in the Hebrew with respect to denoting the gender. See my *Gr.*, § 60, 4. As in Ezek. xxiii. 36-49, where Aholah and Aholibah are spoken of, the suffixes are constantly changed (see especially ver. 46); so here also possibly, the suffixes are changed even after a masculine or feminine idea floated before the mind of the Poet. [The mere recurrence of two not very remarkable words in succession, can hardly be regarded as a quotation. But unfortunately there is in the present instance a dissimilarity which is very prejudicial to the idea of a quotation. Here we read שָׁחַת כְּבֹדִי ; in Jer. xlviii. 18 it is שָׁחַת כְּבֹדִיךָ , and our author

is obliged to suppose a possible scribal error, or to invent an auricular theory of quotation. It seems necessary here to adopt the opinion of those who, according to ROSENUELLER, refer the masculine suffix to God and the feminine to the daughter of Zion. *He swallowed up all her palaces, He destroyed His own strongholds*. This is not to be discarded as a mere conjecture where every other mode of interpretation is purely conjectural. It is recommended by the arguments adduced for the explanation of *his* in ver. 3. It avoids the difficulty of supposing that pronouns of different genders refer to the same person. The *her* refers to the ideal person Israel, the daughter of Jerusalem. *Her palaces* are the habitations of the people. *His own strongholds* are the defences of Zion which is *His* habitation. Grammar and Rhetoric both commend this explanation.—W. H. H.]—**And hath increased or multiplied in the daughter of Judah, see i. 15, mourning and lamentation.** The last words in the original are a beautiful paronomasia, borrowed from Is. xxix. 2, $\text{הָאֵינָהּ וְהָאֵינָהּ}$. [HENDERSON: "Sorrow and sadness." VITRINGA: *Mæror ac mæstitia*. GERLACH: *Betrübniß und Trobsal*. NAEGELSBACH: *Ächzen und Krächzen*]. See $\text{שׂוּאָה וְכִשְׂפָה}$, Gen. i. 2; $\text{שׂוּאָה וְכִשְׂפָה}$, Job xxx. 10; $\text{שָׂמְכָה וְכִשְׂפָה}$, Ez. xxxv. 3.

II. 6, 7.

- 6 And he hath violently taken away his tabernacle, as if it were of a garden; he hath destroyed his places of the assembly: the LORD hath caused the solemn feasts and Sabbaths to be forgotten in Zion, and hath despised, in the indignation of his
7 anger, the king and the priest. The Lord has cast off his altar, he hath abhorred his sanctuary, he hath given up into the hand of the enemy the walls of her palaces; they have made a noise in the house of the LORD, as in the day of a solemn feast.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 6.—The verb חָסַד is found in Jer. xxii. 3; xlii. 22.— שָׁן for שָׁן , see Crit. note below.—The definite article in פֶּנִּי is in accordance with recognized philological usage. See my *Gr.*, § 71, 4 a. DRECHSLER, Is., Vol. ii, p. 203 n. [The definite article was used in comparisons because "the Hebrew commonly conceived of the whole class of objects of which he spoke." See GREEN'S *Gr.*, § 245, 5 d.—W. H. H.]— כִּוְעֵר , the first time is used of *festal place* (see Ps. lxxiv. 8; comp. 1 Sam. xx. 35), and then of the festival itself (see i. 4). [See Crit. note below.]— שָׁכַח . This Piel form is found only here. It must be taken in the accusative sense.— שָׁכַח occurs in Jeremiah only in xvii. 21-27, where the profanation of the Sabbath is referred to. נָאֵץ , in Lamentations only here; in Jer. xiv. 21; xxxiii. 17; xxxiii. 24.— וַעֲנֵם , in Lamentations only here; in Jer. x. 10; xv. 17; i. 25.

Ver. 7. נָאֵץ , three times in Lam., ii. 7; iii. 17, 31, never in Jeremiah.— אָרַגְנִי , see i. 14 [Introd. Add. Rem. p. 32].— נָאֵץ . This verb is found only here and in Ps. lxxxix. 40. [BLAYNEY renders it as Niph., *His sanctuary is accursed*, but conjectures from Sept., *ἀνείραξεν*, the true reading may be נָאֵץ . נָאֵץ substituted for נָאֵץ , *He hath shaken off His Sanctuary*. As the meaning could only be conjectured from the ancient versions (see ALEXANDER, Ps. lxxxix. 40), it is not improbable that the Sept. gave it the sense of נָאֵץ . So BROUGHTON, *cast off*, and CALVIN, *reputit vel rejecit procul ab animo suo*. The fundamental signification of the verb is to *reject*, to *repudiate*. FÜRST gives the Piel sense, *to cast down entirely, to repudiate, to reject*. This agrees with the accepted translation of Ps. lxxxix. 40. The sense of *abhor*, derived from a cognate Arabic root, would suit that place, as well as this; and is more agreeable to the corresponding word in the first clause, נָאֵץ , if the fundamental idea of נָאֵץ is to be *fool*, to *stink*, as GESSENIUS says, though FÜRST, with good reason, denies this. The idea of *abhorring* or of *rejecting* with *disdain* or *disgust*, is given to both these verbs by NAEGELSBACH and GERLACH. NAEGELSBACH translates, *The Lord rejected with disdain His altar, He abhorred His sanctuary*, and GERLACH just reverses the expressions, *The Lord abhorred His altar, He rejected with disdain His sanctuary*.—W. H. H.]— כִּקְרַעְתִּי , See i. 10; ii. 20, twice in Jeremiah, xvii. 12; ii. 51.— הִקְנִי , 1 Sam. xxiii. 20; Ps. xxxi. 9, is not found in Jeremiah. The only part of the verb he uses is the Pual, and that only once, xlii. 19. [NAEGELSBACH translates this verb "verschloss," *shut up*, see marg., E. V.

He makes no remark upon its meaning. FÜRST regards סָבַר to surround, enclose, Hiph. to shut up, and סָבַר to flow out, Hiph. to deliver up, as entirely distinct verbs, and says that "all attempts to unite their meanings must be regarded as failures."—W. H. H.]—אַרְמֹנֵיהָ. The connection requires us to understand this of the sanctuary, although no place can be cited in which אַרְמֹן is used of the Temple; for Jer. xxx. 18, to which some appeal, is to be explained otherwise: See notes on that place. J. D. MICHAELIS would read, אַרְמֹנֵת יְהוָה, palace of Jehovah. קוֹל נְתָנוּ, see Jer. xxii. 20.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[Vers. 6-10 describe particularly the destruction of the holy places. Here God claims a special property. Everything is *His*. The emphatic use of the pronoun, shows that it is also significant in ver. 5, *his strongholds* as distinguished from *her palaces*.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 6. **And He hath violently taken away His tabernacle** (marg., *hedge*) **as if it were of a garden.** *And He laid waste as a garden His tabernacle.* The meaning of the verb is *to use violence, to offer violence.* To do violence to a garden is to lay it waste. The laying waste of a garden has these peculiarities; it is easily done, it is in some sense a crime against nature, and for that reason a garden laid waste is a revolting as well as a sad spectacle.—But what is the meaning of the word שָׁן, translated *tabernacle*

(marg., *hedge*)? That it stands for סֶכֶךְ, cannot be doubted. סֶכֶךְ constantly denotes that sort of (hütte) hut, cot, bower, that is made of wicker-work [or plaited twigs, boughs], also lairs of beasts similarly constructed, Jer. xxv. 38; Ps. x. 9. [J. A. ALEXANDER: "The Hebrew word is commonly applied to any temporary shed or booth, composed of leaves and branches." But, according to FÜRST, the word is derived from סָכַן=to protect, and means properly, "the covering, protecting, screening thing (not a thing woven together out of branches) hence a covering, hut, tent; a covert, lair."—W. H. H.] Then it denotes a house generally, and especially the holy tabernacle, Jehovah's house, Ps. lxxvi. 3; as does also סֶכֶךָ, Ps. xviii. 12; Job xxxvi. 29: comp. סֶכֶת; Am. v. 26.—If now it is said, that the Lord hath done violence to His tabernacle as to a garden, the *tertium comparationis*, the point of the comparison, consists in the *facility* with which the end is accomplished and in the *contrast* between the proper condition of things and that which the laying waste has produced. As easily as one might root up plants, fell trees and plough the ground, has the Lord overthrown the firm walls of His sanctuary; and as sad and incomprehensible as the appearance of a devastated pleasure garden is the spectacle of the sanctuary in ruins. The comparison is the more apt, because the city of God, with her joyous fountains, springing from the dwelling-place of the Most High (Ps. xlv. 5; comp. lxxxiv. 1-4), could with truth be called גֶּן־יְהוָה, *Jehovah's garden* (Is. li. 3), *παράδεισος εὐλογίας*, a *Paradise of glory* (Sirach xl. 27). [On the whole, our English Version seems best to express the true sense of this difficult passage, "and He hath violently taken away His tabernacle as if it were of a garden," i. e., as if it were but such a cottage in the garden as vinedressers were accustomed to build till

the vintage was past. So CALVIN. This interpretation involves a play on the word שָׁן, as properly meaning a *garden house*, and also denoting *God's tabernacle*.—W. H. H.]—**He hath destroyed His places of the assembly.** *He destroyed His place of assembly* (Festort). [So HENDERSON. NOYES: *place of congregation*. BLAYNEY: *His congregation*. It is better (see note below), to translate, *He abolished His appointed services, or solemnities*.—W. H. H.]—**The LORD hath caused the solemn feasts and Sabbaths to be forgotten in Zion.** *Jehovah exterminated [caused to be forgotten] in Zion festival [appointed times of Divine service] and Sabbath.*—The result of the destruction of the place for holding festivals is, that the festivals themselves can no longer be celebrated and are forgotten. By *Zion*, not Mount Zion, but the holy city generally is meant [on the contrary, in the strictest sense the holy places are intended].—W. H. H.]—**And hath despised, in the indignation of His anger, the king and the priest.** *And rejected [so FÜRST also] in the fury of His wrath King and Priest.* Since the festivals are no longer celebrated, those persons who were appointed to officiate in them, are by their omission removed from active service. That the kings belonged to this class of persons is evident, because they were, not only God's representatives to the people, but also intercessors with God in behalf of the people. "The Israelitish king (especially in the persons of David and Solomon) bore a certain priestly character, in that the king at the head of the people and in their name worshipped God and, on the other hand, brought back to the people the Divine blessing (2 Sam. vi. 17, 18; 1 Kings iii. 4; viii. 14, 15, etc.; 55, 56, etc.; 62, 63, etc.; ix. 25; 1 Chron. xxix. 10, 11, etc.; 2 Chron. i. 6; comp. Ez. xvi. 1-12)." OEHLER in HERZ, *Real-Enc.* VIII., pp. 12, 13.

שָׁן. That this word stands for סֶכֶךְ is evident, because, 1. ש and ס frequently are interchanged, especially in the later language (see שָׁן and שָׁנָה, 2 Sam. i. 22, פָּרַשׁ and פָּרַשׁ, Ges. *Thes.*, p. 931. EWALD, § 50 a). 2. We find in Ex. xxxiii. 22 the verbal form שָׁכַח for שָׁכַח, and in Is. v. 5 מְשֻׁכָּח for מְשֻׁכָּח, Mich. vii. 4. 3. Since שָׁכַח and מְשֻׁכָּח occur only in the places cited, and שָׁן is found only here, it would appear that these forms are not so much indications of an independent root שָׁכַח, as merely different ways of writing סֶכֶךְ. [When GERLACH says that סֶכֶךְ never means *hütte*, a *cot*, *tent*, or *tabernacle*, he overlooks Ps. lxxvi. 3, where it undoubtedly describes the holy Temple as God's tabernacle house or dwelling-place. To his argument that שָׁן would be an unsuitable designation of the Temple, because if it means a house at all, it can only mean such a house as a cot or bower made of

twisted branches of trees, it may be replied; 1. the Temple might be so called in allusion to the ancient tabernacle which was temporary and movable; 2. שָׁן may be derived from שָׁן in the generic sense of enclosing, and not in the particular sense of enclosing with a hedge or fence, as שָׁן to *weave*. Indeed GERLACH seems to give up the very point for which he so ably contends, that שָׁן cannot mean a house, when he gives it here the sense of an *enclosure* (Gehege) and applies it to the whole sacred enclosure, including of course the Temple. HENDERSON, also, translates the word *His inclosure*.—W. H. H.] The Sept. translates καὶ διέτασεν ὡς ἀμπέλων τὸ σκηνώμα αὐτῶν [*He tore up as if it had been a vine His tabernacle*]. It would seem that Job xv. 33 was in the mind of the translator, where it is said, יְחִמּוֹס בִּנְפֶּן בָּצְרוֹ [*He shall shake off his unripe grape as the vine*, E. V. EWALD accepts (in his 3d ed.) the Sept. translation, and supposes בִּנְפֶּן, instead of בָּצְרוֹ, to be the true reading. To this GERLACH objects—1. That חָסַם cannot mean to *tear up*, to *pull out*; 2. The conjecture that בִּנְפֶּן may have existed in the text is unnecessary, since the Sept. translator may have interpreted שָׁן as a vineyard and translated it by ἀμπέλος—a vine, as כָּרִם is translated by the Sept. in Lev. xxv. 3, 4.—W. H. H.] The explanation of PAREAU, ROSENUELLER and KALKAR, *et violenter abripuit sicut sepe horti sepe suam* [NOYES: *He hath violently torn away His hedge, like the hedge of a garden*], according to which בָּצְרוֹ would be taken for בָּצְרָה, is not grammatically allowable, since such an omission of the governing word, after the particle of comparison, could only occur where the context necessarily required the word to be supplied,—as, for example, when it is said, Is. lxiii. 2, בָּצְרָה כִּרְרָה בָּנָה ["thy garments like the garments of him that treadeth in the winevat"], we supply the idea of בָּצְרָה before בָּנָה, because the garments could not be compared to the person of the man treading the wine-press. So Gen. xviii. 11 and other passages which might be adduced here, are to be explained. See my *Gr.*, § 65, 3, note 103, 2. But in our passage there is no necessity for supplying שָׁן before בָּן, because the laying waste of the house can very well be compared to devastation of a garden. The explanation of THENIUS, "He injured that which was, in respect to His house (שָׁן), standing in an entirely subordinate relation, the garden, by which is meant the Temple courts," is altogether too artificial. If the courts could be called the garden of the Temple, for which, however, THENIUS adduces no evidence, why did not the Prophet at once call it simply שָׁן? [GERLACH: "The translation of THENIUS, *He injured as the garden of His tabernacle*, i. e., that which was the garden with respect to His Tabernacle, speaking analogically (whereby the two courts surrounding the Temple-edifice and connected by terraces, would be designated, which might be poetically regarded as the garden belonging to the Palace of the King of Israel), requires בָּן to be taken in the construct case in spite of the article—an anomaly,

for the justification of which (see EWALD, § 290, d; GESENIUS, § 108, 2, n) something more is demanded than the remark, 'שָׁן stands in an entirely subordinate relation,' for in point of fact it absolutely determines the meaning of בָּן,—"the garden of His tabernacle."—סִיגָר. This word occurs six times in Lam., i. 4, 15; ii. 6, *bis*, 7, 22. Our translators render it in five different ways, and in this verse, where it occurs twice, in two different senses. In i. 4; ii. 6 they call it the *solemn feasts*; in i. 15, an *assembly*; in ii. 6, *places of the assembly*; and the phrase יוֹם סִיגָר, they translate in ii. 7, as in the day of a *solemn feast*, and in ii. 22, as in a *solemn day*. That the word could have such variety of meaning in such close connection is improbable. The word is derived from שָׁר, to *appoint*. It means something *fixed*, *determined upon*, *appointed*. It is used in the sense of a *set time*, an *appointed place*, a *time or place appointed for meeting together*, especially for purposes of religious worship, and hence the regularly appointed and observed ordinances or services of worship. As connected with the assembling of the congregation for worship, it is not unlikely that the word acquired some ambiguity in its use, like our English word *church*, referring sometimes to time or place of service, sometimes to the people engaged in the service, and sometimes to the service itself. But we can always trace in the use of the Hebrew word its original signification of a *set or appointed time, place or service*: and never, perhaps, has it the simple unqualified meaning of an *assembly, a congregation, a festive occasion*. There is no necessity of ascribing to it so many significations in the Lamentations, and two entirely different meanings in two successive lines of this one verse. In i. 15 it may have its primitive meaning of a *set time*. In ii. 7, 22 the phrase יוֹם סִיגָר may mean a *day appointed, fixed upon, predetermined*, for any especial occasion. In the other three places, where it occurs, it refers to the services appointed to be celebrated in the Temple. The reference is probably to the *daily services* of sacrifice, praise and prayer. The cessation of the annual feasts and greater festivals, which were of infrequent occurrence, would not be so remarkable as the abrupt and entire cessation of morning and evening prayer which had been observed, without intermission, for nearly five hundred years, or ever since the Temple was first consecrated.—There is, therefore, no real difference in the use of this word in the Prophecies of Jeremiah and in the Lamentations.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 7. *The Lord hath cast off*—*The Lord rejected with disdain*—His altar.—He hath abhorred—He abhorred—His sanctuary. The altar and sanctuary are recognized as the central points and chief places of Divine worship. By this it is obvious that קִדְשָׁה, sanctuary, here must signify, not in its widest sense the Temple generally, which has been already sufficiently indicated by שָׁן, tabernacle, and בֵּית, place of assembly, ver. 6, but in its narrower sense the sanctuary proper, the Temple which contained the Holy place and Holy of Holies. This sense best corresponds with מִזְבֵּחַ [an altar, in the widest

sense, or place where offerings are made.—W. H. H.] for not the altar alone, but the holy place and the holy of holies were places of offering (Ex. xxx. 1-10).—**He hath given up—He gave up—into the hand of her enemy the walls of her palaces.** The connection requires us to understand by the walls of her palaces the walls of the sanctuary. [The altar is treated with contempt, the holy places are defiled, the edifice itself is given into the power of the enemy, and where we once heard the voices of a worshipping people, is heard now the wild clamor of heathen idolators.—W. H. H.].—**They have made a noise—they shouted, or raised a cry or clamor—in the house of the LORD—in the house of Jehovah—as in the day of a solemn feast** [lit., like a day—a time appointed, which can only refer to some regularly appointed festival of the church, and is here to be so translated,

though we might render in conformity with ver. 6 and ch. i. 4, 15, a day of appointed religious services, with reference, however, to the great festivals of the church.—W. H. H.]. A clamor, loud as a festival jubilee, but of a different origin and character, is heard in the temple. It is a festival for their enemies, not for Israel (i. 15). At this feast Israel is the victim sacrificed. [WORDSWORTH: “a noise, a cry of jubilee. There is a contrast between the former shout of festal joy of worshippers in the Temple, and the cry of exultation of the Chaldeans, ‘Down with it!

Down with it to the ground!’” GERLACH: קֹל (cry) is not to be understood, with PAREAU and ROSENMUELLER, of the war-cry, but of the shouts of joy and triumph on the part of the enemy, as the comparison with the jubilee-festival shows (see Is. xxx. 29).” See crit. note, ver. 6.]

II. 8, 9.

- 8 The LORD hath purposed to destroy the wall of the daughter of Zion; he hath stretched out a line, he hath not withdrawn his hand from destroying: therefore
9 he made the rampart and the wall to lament; they languished together. Her gates are sunk into the ground; he hath destroyed and broken her bars: her king and her princes are among the Gentiles: the law is no more; her prophets also find no vision from the LORD.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 8.—הִשְׁחִיתָ, often in Jeremiah, ii. 30; iv. 7; xxxvi. 29, etc.; in Lam. only here.—קָל, Jer. xxxi. 39, K'ri.—Kal of אָבָל in Jer. xii. 11; xiv. 2; xxiii. 10; Hiph. only in Ez. xxxi. 15 and here.—חָל, not in Jer.—אָחֵל is used in a precisely similar way in Jer. xiv. 2.

Ver. 9.—שָׁבַר, Piel, in Lam. only here, in Jer. often, xii. 17; xv. 7; xxiii. 1; li. 55.—שָׁבַר, in Lam. only here and iii. 4, in Jer. xliii. 13, comp. li. 30.—בָּרִיתִי, Jer. xlix. 31; li. 30.—חָוָה, Jer. xiv. 14; xxiii. 16.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 8. **The LORD hath purposed—Jehovah purposed—to destroy the wall of the daughter of Zion.** As has been remarked, we are explicitly informed, Jer. lii. 13, 14; 2 Kings xxv. 9, 10, that four weeks after the capture of the city, Nebuchadnezzar had destroyed the Temple, the houses and the city walls. Of the destruction of the walls the passages cited speak with special emphasis (Jer. lii. 14 and 2 Kings xxv. 10), “and all the army of the Chaldeans, that were with the captain of the guard, brake down the walls of Jerusalem round about.”—**He hath stretched out a line—He stretched out the measuring-line.** The architect employs the measuring line in order to build correctly. Jehovah applies it in order to level the wall to the ground in the most literal manner. This figure substantially occurs in Amos vii. 7-9; the expression first occurs in Is. xxxiv. 11; 2 Kings xxi. 13 and Job xxxviii. 5 [see Zech. i. 16. GERLACH: “The use of the measuring line denotes that the destruction of the building will be executed with the same rigorous precision with which an architect carries out his preconceived plan. MICHAELIS’ explanation is too artificial; ‘a line, as it

were, designated the extent of the destruction, that the devastating punishment might be proportionate to the guilt.” J. A. ALEXANDER: on Is. xxxiv. 11. “The sense of the metaphor may be, either that God has laid this work out for Himself and will perform it (BARNES), or that in destroying He will act with equity and justice (GILL), or that even in destroying He will proceed deliberately and by rule (KNOBEL), which last sense is well expressed in ROSENMUELLER’S paraphrase, *ad mensuram vastabitur, ad regulam depopulabitur*,” it is laid waste by measure, it is depopulated by rule. While the idea of the thoroughness and completeness of the work of destruction, as indicated by GERLACH, suits better here than any of the other explanations suggested above, and is undoubtedly included in the meaning of the words, yet the main thought is, that God Himself predetermined the extent of the destruction; *Jehovah purposed it* and *He stretched out a line* to mark its beginning and its end. Human instruments were both incited and restrained by Him. It was a line stretched out, not after, but before the destruction, not to show its extent, but to define its limits, “designed to point out what was to be destroyed” (OWEN).—W. H. H.]—**He hath not withdrawn his hand from destroying** (marg., *swallowing up*). *He with-*

drew, or averted not, His hand, see ver. 3, from *devouring*, destroying, swallowing up, see ver. 2. [What He had designed, He executed. He withdrew not His hand till the full measure of destruction indicated by the line was complete.—W. H. H.].—**Therefore He made—Then made He—the rampart and the wall to lament—rampart and wall mourn.** The two words, rampart and wall, are united as here in Is. xxvi. 1. “Rampart,” חָלָל (see 2 Sam. xx. 15; Ob. 20) is the *pomærium*, the circumvallation, or the smaller wall in front of the chief wall. [FUEERST: “The outermost fence of fortifications, the glacis, the (outermost) rampart around the city walls, *pomærium*, πορτειχισμα, *antennurale*.” In 2 Sam. xx. 15 it is rendered in E. V. by “trench.” In Ob. 20, not expressed in E. V., it means, according to FUEERST, a *province*.—W. H. H.].—**They languished together.** A *prospopoeia*, as in the preceding expression, “He made rampart and wall mourn,” and in i. 4. Comp. vers. 18, 19.

Ver. 9. [In vers. 1-8 the Lord executing His wrath has been constantly before us. Now the work is done: and in vers. 9, 10, we are afforded a brief glance at the results, after the catastrophe was over.—W. H. H.] The first part of this verse may be taken as a continuation and conclusion of the foregoing description; or as merely a recapitulation, by way of transition to what follows. If the latter is correct, then the gates are to be regarded as a part of the walls, and with the walls sunken into the ground. But, since the gates constituted the most important part of the walls, and were in fact the very centres of public life (see their use as *Forums*, Deut. xxi. 19; Ruth iv. 1; 2 Sam. xix. 9; 1 Kings xxii. 10) and were moreover the keys to the city, we may regard them as representative of the city itself, and so understand the first part of ver. 9, as a comprehensive conclusion of the preceding description.

—**Her gates are sunk into the ground.** The sense of the verb by itself (סָכַן) is not to *sink down*, but to *sink into*), as well as the prefix נִ, shows that סָכַן is not to the *earth*, but *into the earth*. The ruined gates sink into the earth, and on account of the accumulation of ruins are buried beneath the level of the ground. [ASSEM. ANNOT. “The Jewish Doctors upon the place, out of their Talmudists, tell us strange stories of the gates of Jerusalem sinking down into the ground, that they might not come into the enemies’ power, because they were the work of David’s hands: and some of ours run as wildly wide another way, expounding it of the Priests and Judges that were wont to sit in the gates, see v. 14. I conceive no more to be meant than that the gates were thrown down to the ground, and lying along there (such of them and such parts of them as had escaped the fire, i. 4; Neh. i. 3; ii. 3, 13, 17), were buried in the rubbish when the walls were demolished. See Neh. ii. 13, 14; iv. 10.” GERLACH: “This is said of the gates because they were so completely destroyed (PAREAU, THENIUS, *buried under rubbish*), that no more trace could be seen of them than if they had sunk into the ground, not because (as MICHAELIS says) the gates overthrown by the enemy sunk into ditches dug under them.”]—**He hath destroyed and broken.**—*He destroyed and broke in pieces* [liter-

ally and phonetically *shivered*, שָׁבַר]—**her bars**

[the bars that secured the gates, see Ps. cvii. 16.—W. H. H.].—**Her King and her Princesses are among the Gentiles, the heathen.** From this point the discourse relates to persons instead of things. If the king and princes were already among the heathen, then the transportation into exile had already taken place.—**The law is no more**—*there is no law*, (*Kein Gesetz ist mehr vorhanden*). תּוֹרָה, *law*, may denote by itself the whole law, a particular part of the law, or the law as a rule of conduct, considered, however, subjectively with respect to the theory, *i. e.*, as the matter of instruction (*institutio, doctrina*) is in fact the fundamental meaning of the word).

Add to this that תּוֹרָה אֵין, *there is no law*, may grammatically refer to the whole preceding sentence (“there they cannot practise the law,” LUTHER) [the King and Princesses are among the Gentiles, where they cannot observe the law]; or merely to בְּנֵי־גוֹיִם, *among the Gentiles* (“who have no divine revelation,” KALKAR), [“among the Gentiles” who are “without law,” which would be a correct translation of the Hebrew. HUGH BROUGHTON gives this sense and refers to Rom. ii. 14, “Her King and her Princesses are among the heathen that have no law.”—W. H. H.]; or it may be taken as an independent proposition. If we compare such passages as Jer. xviii. 18

(לֹא-תֵאבֵד תּוֹרָה מִפִּהוּ), “the law shall not perish

from the priest”), Ez. vii. 26 (תּוֹרָה תֵּאבֵד מִפִּהוּ),

“but the law shall perish from the priest”),

Mal. ii. 7 (תּוֹרָה יִבְקֹשׁוּ מִפִּיהוּ), “and they should

seek the law at his mouth”), we would incline to

the opinion that תּוֹרָה, *law*, refers only to instruc-

tion out of the law and administration of the law

by the priests. But why then are not the priests

named? And have not the kings and princes,

as judges and guardians of the legal order (Deut.

xvii. 8-20), their share in the administration of

law? I believe, therefore, that while תּוֹרָה אֵין

there is no law, is to be taken as an independent

proposition, it is to be understood in the widest

sense, as indicating that there was no longer any

sort of administration (whether priestly or king-

ly) of the law. [GERLACH adopts the translation

Her king and her princes are among the heathen with-

out law, with LUTHER’s explanation, referring

the words *without law* to the whole preceding

part of the sentence, “Her king and her princes

are among the heathen where they cannot ob-

serve the law, or enjoy it.” A strong objection

to this is that it transfers our thoughts and sym-

pathies from the deplorable condition of Jerusa-

lem, which is here the subject of description, to

the personal condition of her king and princes in

a far distant land. Besides, the very structure

of the sentence leads us to expect something di-

rectly relating to the daughter of Zion. When

we are told that *her king and her princes* are

among the heathen, we are prepared to hear of

some evil resulting to her from their absence.

What that evil result is, we are in fact informed

if we understand the Poet to mean, that on ac-

count of the absence of “her king and her

princes," she is deprived of "the law." This agrees substantially with NÆGELSBACH's interpretation, but he has erred in making two wholly independent sentences of what is really only one, though consisting of two poetical parts as the rhetorical structure requires. The correct translation is—*Her king and her princes among the heathen—there is no law.* This is recommended by the two arguments which GERLACH very forcibly urges in favor of his rendering. 1. It is in accordance with the Hebrew accents, which NÆGELSBACH entirely ignores and violates, and which connect the words *without law*, or *there is no law* with what precedes. 2. "This explanation, agreeing with the accents, is further recommended by the fact that the two last members of verse 9 describe the fate of those persons, standing to the city in the relation of Helpers and Counsellors or Comforters (her king and her prophets), of whose help and counsel, or comfort, the city had been deprived, even as (according to the first member of ver. 9) she had been deprived of the external means of protection. It is the deprivation of all these, formerly the medium of divine help, that the Poet mourns (see Hos. iii. 4; xiii. 10; Is. iii. 2)," GERLACH. Another argument for the translation suggested is, that it renders a verb in the first part of the sentence unnecessary, or helps us at least readily to supply it. If we make two wholly independent sentences, as NÆGELSBACH does, then there is not in the whole book a similar instance of the omission of a verb: and, indeed, it is somewhat conjectural what verb ought to be supplied; the simple fact, that the king and princes are among the Gentiles, is not of itself and necessarily an evil, we must add to this another idea that they are *exiled, or imprisoned, or disgraced, or suffering, or dying* among the Gentiles. If, on the other hand, we read the two clauses as intimately connected and interdependent, as the accents imply, then the proper verb in the first clause, if indeed any verb is necessary, is suggested by the last clause, and the construction is not wholly unparalleled in the book. *Her king and her princes among the nations—there is no law*, plainly means (Because), *her king and her princes (are) among the nations—there is (for her) no law.* So in i. 2. *And her tears on her cheek, there is no comforter to her from all her lovers*, means undoubtedly, *and her tears (are) on her cheek (because) there is no comforter*, etc. In both cases the two clauses are related as cause and effect, and in both the use of the Hebrew לֹא , which contains in itself the verb "to be," prevents what would be the case otherwise and what would be an anomaly in this book, the occurrence of a whole sentence without a single verb expressed. In the other instances in this book, in which our English translators have thought it necessary to supply the verb *to be*, its omission in the original is highly poetical and very expressive. 1. 4. "And she *is* in bitterness," $\text{וְהָיָא בִּי-צָרָה}$, lit. *and she—bitterness to her*, and i. 20, "for I *am* in distress," כִּי-צָרָלִי , lit. *for trouble to me*, are Hebrew idioms quite synonymous with the old English forms "woe's her," "woe's me!" In i. 22, "for my sighs *are* many, and my heart *is* faint," lit. *for many my sighs, to my heart sickness*, the omis-

sion of the verb, while it does not mar the sense, intensifies the expression, when these words are read in their close connection with the preceding prayer. So in our text, the absence of the verb is due to the broken, rapid, vehement style of the poetry of passion; *Her king and her princes among the heathen—there is no law.* But if we take the first clause as a complete and separate statement of the mere fact that her king and her princes are among heathen, the omission of the verb must be regarded as a blemish and a carelessness of which the writer of the Lamentations is no where else guilty.—The meaning of *law*, according to this interpretation is obvious. The law of the land, which was the law of God as especially revealed for the government of the Jewish theocracy, is no longer observed and administered, for its guardians and administrators, the king and the princes are in exile. All "legal observances" were swept away (HENDERSON). The law, moral, ceremonial and judicial, as regarded its administration in Judea, "was no more" (OWEN).—W. H. II.]—*Her prophets also find no vision from the LORD.* *Also her prophets receive no longer vision* [revelation from God, divine communication] *from Jehovah.* These words have been taken as evidence that the Poet, in the whole of the foregoing description, had in mind only the condition of the Israelites remaining in the land. But if Jeremiah received an answer to the question which he put to the Lord ten days after he asked it (Jer. xlii. 4, 7), then it could not be said that the prophets could receive *no vision* from the Lord. I believe, therefore, that the Poet here had in mind the great body of the people who had been carried into exile. Those who, with their king, princes and priests, were "among the heathen," and on that account "without law," were the ones who were also without prophets. [Not the people as such, whether in exile, or remaining in Judea, but the ideal person of "the daughter of Zion" (see vers. 1, 4, 8, 10) is the subject of this description. That *her gates* were sunken into the ground and *her bars* broken into pieces, localizes the scene depicted in Jerusalem. It is, further, *her king and her princes* who are "among the heathen," so that *she* is left "without law." In strict reference to this mystical personage, representing the genius of the theocratic people mourning amid the ruins of Jerusalem, it is now added "*also her prophets find no vision from Jehovah.*" To suppose the Poet in the first clause of the verse to speak of Jerusalem, and in the two following clauses of the people in exile, is to cause an abrupt transition from one subject to another subversive of all unity of construction, and to cover with a cloud of rhetorical confusion, in addition to the cloud of Divine anger, the unique and beautiful conception of the daughter of Zion sitting solitary and forlorn, weeping, helpless and comfortless, amidst the ruins of the theocratic city. If, as NÆGELSBACH argues, it could not be said that the people remaining in the land were without "vision from Jehovah," because Jeremiah received an answer to his question as related in Jer. xlii. 4-7, much less may it be affirmed that the exiles were without "vision from Jehovah," since at that very time Ezekiel was exercising his prophetic office in Babylonia.

In point of fact, however, the time of which the Poet speaks is subsequent to the period referred to in Jer. xlii. 4-7: a time, not only succeeding the destruction of the city and the transportation of the mass of the people to Babylonia, but posterior to the flight of the fugitives to Egypt, carrying the Prophet with them, as is evident especially from Lam. iv. 17-20; v. 6, 9. At this time, doubtless, Jeremiah himself in Egypt, and Ezekiel and perhaps Daniel in Babylonia, and not improbably other prophets, whose names have not come down to us, were speaking to the people as moved by the Holy Ghost. How then could it be said that the prophets of the daughter of Zion found no vision from Jehovah, since whatever was spoken by a prophet of God, whether in Jerusalem or at any distance from it, was, according to our theocratic idea, intended for the whole church, however its members might be scattered? The answer is that her prophets found no vision from Jehovah which had for its object her deliverance from her present sorrows. Her material defences were broken down, her natural guardians and the administrators of her laws were in captivity, and her prophets had no word from the Lord for her relief,

her help, her comfort. Indeed the words of her prophets at this time, as these very Lamentations show, while not without intimations of a future deliverance, destroyed every vestige of hope of any immediate interposition of God in her behalf. Jeremiah delivered no encouraging prophecies to the Jews after the city was destroyed. There is nothing in Ezekiel of an encouraging character, after this event was fully consummated, if we except the obscure visions relating to a remote future in the last chapters of his book. Daniel delivered no prophecy containing any promise of temporal blessing to the Jews, till towards the very close of the captivity. As SCOTT remarks, "There seems to have been at this period a very peculiar suspension of that information and encouragement, which the prophets had for many ages been employed to communicate to the people. Except Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, no prophet is mentioned from the beginning to the end of the captivity, when Haggai and Zechariah were raised up. This chasm was an evident token of divine displeasure, and must have been a very sensible aggravation of the suffering endured by the pious remnant."

II. 10.

- 10 The elders of the daughter of Zion sit upon the ground, and keep silence: they have cast up the dust upon their heads; they have girded themselves with sackcloth: the virgins of Jerusalem hang down their heads to the ground.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 10.—**יֹשְׁבֵי לָאָרֶץ**. See **כָּרְדוּ לָאָרֶץ**, Jer. xiv. 2 [*they lie mourning on the ground*].—The form **יָדְמוּ** (see OLSH., § 143, d, 265 c) is not without analogies in Jeremiah, for he says **נָדְמָה**, viii. 14; **הָרָמִינָה**, xiv. 17 [FÜRST makes the word Niph., DAVIDSON, Kal.].—**נָפְרָה** does not occur in Jeremiah [nor any equivalent for it.—W. H. H.].—**חָגְרוּ שָׂקִים**, see Jer. iv. 8; vi. 26; xlix. 3.—**הוֹרִיד**, Jer. xlix. 16; li. 40.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 10. To the dignitaries of the Theocracy there belonged two classes, in whose sorrow the grief of the people found its most eloquent expression,—these were the elders and the virgins. See i. 4, 18, 19. [These are now introduced as mourning over the devastated Zion, the absence of the law and of prophetic vision.—W. H. H.]—**The elders of the daughter of Zion sit upon the ground and keep silence** [lit. *They sit on the ground, they keep silent, elders of daughter Zion*]. The elders, formerly called together to give counsel, now are silent without any counsel to give. [They are speechless, not only

counselless. They have no words even for sorrow. "Small griefs are eloquent,—great ones dumb" (CLARKE).—W. H. H.]—**They have cast up dust upon their heads—they sprinkle dust on their head.** [Lit., *They cast up, or throw up dust upon their head.*] See Josh. vii. 6; Job ii 12; Ez. xxvii. 30.—**They have girded themselves with sackcloth—they gird on** [or *put on*] **sackcloth** [or *sacks*].—**The virgins of Jerusalem hang down their heads to the ground—The virgins of Jerusalem sink to the earth their head** The virgins also, who were wont to be called officially to act as the mouth-piece of the people, when the feeling of general joy was to be expressed, now are dumb and hang down their heads to the ground.

PART II.

II. VERS. 11-22.

- 2 VER. 11. Mine eyes failed with tears,
 My bowels were troubled,
 My liver was poured on the ground,
 For the ruin of the daughter of my people,—
 Because child and suckling fainted away
 In the streets of the city!
- 3 VER. 12. To their mothers they say—
 Where is corn and wine?—
 Whilst they fainted as the wounded
 In the streets of the city,—
 Whilst they poured out their soul
 Into their mothers' bosom.
- 4 VER. 13. What can I testify to thee?
 What liken to thee, thou daughter of Jerusalem?
 What compare to thee,
 That I may comfort thee, daughter of Zion?
 For great as the sea is thy ruin!
 Who can heal thee?
- 5 VER. 14. Thy prophets predicted for thee
 Falsehood and delusion,
 And uncovered not thy guilt
 To avert thy captivity.
 But then they predicted for thee
 False burdens and expulsions!
- 6 VER. 15. All that passed by the way
 Clapped their hands at thee;
 They hissed and wagged their head
 At the daughter of Jerusalem.
 Is this the city of which they used to say—
 Perfect in beauty,—Joy of the whole earth?
- 7 VER. 16. All thine enemies
 Gaped at thee with their mouth,
 They hissed and gnashed the teeth;
 They said,—We have utterly destroyed—
 Yea, this is the day we have looked for—
 We have found [it]—we have seen [it]!
- 8 VER. 17. Jehovah did what He purposed:
 He fulfilled His word
 That He commanded in the days of old.
 He demolished and pitied not.
 He made the enemy joyful over thee;
 He exalted the horn of thine adversaries:
- 9 VER. 18. Their heart cried out unto the Lord.
 O wall of the daughter of Zion,
 Let tears run down like a river
 Day and night,
 Give thyself no rest,
 Let not the daughter of thine eye cease.

- ק VER. 19. Arise—cry in the night—
 In the beginning of the night watches;
 Pour out thy heart like water
 Before the face of Jehovah:
 Lift up thy hands to Him, for the life of thy young children,
 That faint for hunger, at the head of every street.
- ר VER. 20. See, Jehovah, and look!
 To whom hast Thou done this?
 Should women eat their fruit—
 Children whom they have nursed?
 Should Priest and Prophet
 Be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord?
- ש VER. 21. The boy and the old man
 Lay on the ground in the streets.
 My virgins and my young men
 Fell by the sword.
 Thou hast killed—in the day of Thy wrath—
 Hast slain—hast not pitied!
- ת VER. 22. Thou callest together, as on an appointed day of solemnity,
 My terrors from round about.
 And there was not, in the day of Jehovah's wrath,
 One that escaped or was exempt.
 Those I have nursed and brought up—
 My enemy consumed them.

ANALYSIS.

[These verses, strictly speaking, constitute the lamentation, for which the preceding description has prepared the way and furnished the theme.—W. H. H.] In ver. 11 the Poet describes his own suffering, especially as produced by the terrible fate of the starving children and their mothers, ver. 12. In vers. 13, 14 the Poet seeks to inform us of the extent, and, at the same time, of the moral cause, of their misfortunes. In vers. 15, 16 he describes the malicious rejoicings of their enemies. In ver. 17 he draws attention to the fact that the great catastrophe was simply the punishment of disobedience, which God had long determined upon and predicted. Vers. 18, 19 are an exhortation to a prayer of wailing, addressed to the personified wall of Jerusalem [Zion]. To this exhortation vers. 20–22 are the response. So this chapter closes, like ch. i., with a sort of prayer, which, however, is not a direct prayer, but only upbraids God by asking how He could have permitted such horrible and outrageous crimes!

II. 11, 12.

- 11 Mine eyes do fail with tears, my bowels are troubled, my liver is poured upon the earth, for the destruction of the daughter of my people; because the children and
 12 the sucklings swoon in the streets of the city. They say to their mothers, Where is corn and wine? when they swooned as the wounded in the streets of the city, when their soul was poured out into their mothers' bosom.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 11.—כָּלִי עֵינָהֶם, in Jer. xiv. 6.—The plural דְּמִיעוֹת, only here and Ps. lxxx. 6. Jer. uses only the *Sing.*, viii. 23; ix. 17; xlii. 17; xiv. 17; xxxi. 16.—[The Niph. נִשְׁפָּךְ cannot have active sense, which NAGELSBACH gives it, nor is this necessary to his interpretation of the passage.—W. H. H.]—כִּבְרִי, the liver (never in Jer.), see Ex. xxix. 13, 22; Lev. iii. 4, etc., so called because *omnium viscerum et gravissimum et densissimum est* (GALEN, *de usu partium*, 6, 7, in *Ges. Theol.* p. 656). [Sept. translates it ἡ δόξα μου, *my glory*. But the undoubted use of the word as meaning the liver, and its connection here with eyes and bowels, are conclusive.—W. H. H.]—שִׁבְרֵי בֶת-עֲמִי, is entirely Jeremiaic, vi. 14; viii. 11, 21. Again in Lam. iii. 48; iv. 10.—Verb עָטַף, three times in this chap, vers. 11, 12, 19; never in Jer.—יוֹנֵק, Comp. Jer. xlv. 7.—חֶבֶב, and קָרָה, not unusual in Jer., v. 1; ix. 20; xlix. 25.

Ver. 12.—The Hithp. הִשְׁתַּפֵּךְ, besides here, only in iv. 1 and Job xxx. 16.—חֵיק, Jer. xxxii. 18.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

In vers. 11, 12 the Poet proceeds to describe his own grief. Ver. 11. **Mine eyes do fail**

with tears—mine eyes have become dim in consequence of tears [mine eyes failed with tears; Old English, were spent, BROUGHTON. The eyes are represented as exhausted, worn out, by weeping.—W. H. H.]. See Jer. xiv. 6; Lam. iv. 17; Ps.

lix. 4; cxix. 82, 123.—**My bowels are troubled**—*my bowels are tumultuously moved*. See i. 20. He depicts his sorrowful emotions by showing how his eyes and bowels have become affected by them. [Bowels, here as elsewhere, are used in a sense entirely figurative. His eyes, literally, wept. But the poet never intended to indicate the literal movement of his bowels as an evidence of his grief. The bowels, according to Hebrew habits of thought and expression, were the seat of mental emotions, especially of a painful nature. His tears kept pace with his agony of mind. A correct translation would be, *my soul was greatly moved*. See notes on i. 20. The verbs in this verse are preterites, and ought to be so rendered.—W. H. H.]—**My liver is poured out upon the earth**—*my liver has fallen out to the earth* [lit., *was poured out on the ground*]. The pouring out of the liver cannot be understood as if it were emptied of its fluid contents, for it has no such contents. Nor can we say that, properly speaking, the flowing out of the bile, caused by compression of the liver, is intended. So FUEHRER, who explains this text by Job xvi. 13. For in that case, the bile should be designated as being poured out. Rather, the Poet would say, that the liver itself falls out from him, as it were; as we say that a man's heart falls out from him [that he loses heart?]. The liver is thus evidently regarded as the seat of emotions, the reverse of those which at that time controlled the Poet. The liver is described as the seat of pleasure and courage (see DELITZSCH, *Psychologie*, IV., § 13, p. 228, 1st ed.; p. 268, 2d ed.). The falling out of the liver, then, denotes the loss of all joyousness and courage; and is conceived of, it would seem, as the consequence and climax of the fermentation of the viscera in general, described in what precedes. The whole phrase is peculiar to this passage. [The physiological explanations of many commentators (see BLAYNEY, HENDERSON) require us to regard the Poet as suffering from bilious diarrhoea. The Hebrews (probably not so well versed in physiology as the commentators imagine) identified the *physical life* with the substance of the *soul*, and associated *mental activity* with the organs and functions of *physical vitality*, locating intellectual action in the head and heart, and purely emotional in the heart and lower viscera, as *the liver* and *the bowels*. Remembering this, we may dismiss the unpleasant suggestions of the movement of the bowels and ejection of bile from the liver, in the literal sense, and, escaping the painful presumptions of colic and jaundice, allow our Poet to express the anguish of his soul in the metaphorical language of his race. The *liver* is here regarded, says NOYES, as the seat of feeling, and its being *poured out on the ground*, remarks GERLACH, is explained by such analogous expressions as Ps. xlii. 5, *I pour out my soul*; Job xxx. 16, *My soul is poured out*. "Here, as with regard to many other of the bodily organs as mentioned in Scripture, there is not only a literal sense capable of universal interpretation, but a metaphorical import that cannot be communicated by any literal version, unless when the same metaphorical signification happens to exist also in the language into which the translation is made. Dr. J. M. GOOD touches on this

subject in the Preface to his Translation of the Song of Songs, and is disposed to contend that such allusions, in order to convey their real signification, should be rendered, not literally, but equivalently; and we so far agree with him as to think that the force and delicacy of many passages must be necessarily impaired and their true meaning lost, when the name merely is given, in a language where that name does not involve the same metaphorical idea. * * * Among ourselves the *spleen* is supposed to be the region of disappointment and melancholy. But were a Jew to be told, in his own tongue, that the inimitable COWPER had long labored under the *spleen*, he would be ignorant of the meaning of his interpreter; and, when at last informed of it, might justly tell him that, although he had literally rendered the words, he had by no means conveyed the idea" (*The Pictorial Bible*).—W. H. H.]—**For the destruction—on account of the ruin—of the daughter of my people, because the children and the sucklings swoon (marg., faint) in the streets of the city.** [Lit., *in the languishing or fainting of child and sucking-babe in the streets of the city*.] The Poet's grief was caused by the ruin of his people in general, but especially by the frightful sufferings of the poor children, which he represents as the very acme of the calamity.

Ver. 12. The Poet describes, in a manner graphic and true to nature, what he had said in a general way (ver. 11) of the wasting away of the children. The strokes of his pencil are few in number, but suffice to place before our eyes an exact picture of those heart-rending scenes.—**They say to their mothers**—*To their mothers they said*. The imperfect (אָמַרְוּ) is used to indicate an act in the past often repeated. Comp. my *Gr.*, § 87, f. For it is evident the Poet describes a past condition of things, namely, that ensuing on the capture of the city. At that time, when neither the famished city (see Jer. lii. 6), nor the conqueror, who had no time then to think of it, furnished the means of subsistence, the famine must have been at its highest stage. [The word, which is future in form, should undoubtedly be translated by our present. So E. V., CALVIN, BROUGHTON, BLAYNEY, HENDERSON, GERLACH. It is an instance of the future used, as our present is, in graphic descriptions. See ver. 1, אָמַרְוּ, covers. *To their mothers they say*.—W. H. H.]—**Where is corn and wine?** *Corn* (אֵין) which usually occurs in connection with grapes (תִּירוֹשׁ, see Jer. xxxi. 12), here denotes, neither baked bread alone, as most commentators think, nor only roasted corn, parched corn, as THENIUS would have it. For the hungry children longed only for food in general [not for a particular kind of food]. *Corn*, here, is to be taken, therefore, in the general sense, which לֶחֶם, *bread*, formerly had, a meaning which the word seems to have in Ps. lxxviii. 24 also, where the manna is called *corn of heaven*, אֵין-שָׁמַיִם. The Poet does not say, but every one feels, how this question, which they could not answer, must have cut into the hearts of those mothers.—**When they swooned—whilst they fainted** [lit., in fainting]

xxi. 11; Prov. vii. 21. [OWEN: "There seems to be a mistake in this word of a $\aleph$ for a η , two letters very similar: for the Targ. the Syr. and the Arab. must have so read the word, as they render it in the sense of what is deceptive, fallacious, or imaginary. It is in the last rendered *phantasm*. The word occurs in Jer. xxii. 14, and is applied to chambers through which air or wind passed freely. It may be rendered here winds or airy things. Such was the character of their prophecies. This is far more suitable to the passage than expulsions or rejections, as given by the *Sept.* and *Vulg.*" As the verb $\eta\aleph$ sometimes, though rarely, has the sense of *misleading, seducing*, may not the idea of *fallacious* have been derived from $\eta\aleph$? There is no necessity, however, for imposing such a meaning upon it here.—W. H. II.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

In these two closely connected verses, the Poet expresses the thought that the true prophets cannot repair the injury the bad prophets have caused. He greatly desires to comfort Zion, by way of prophetic testimony in her behalf, and by way of comparison to her advantage with other sufferers. But it is impossible: for immeasurable and irretrievable injury has been done by the false testimony of her prophets.

Ver. 13. **What thing shall I take to witness for thee? What testify I to thee?** [*What can I testify to thee?*—W. H. H.] The Poet means prophetic testimony (see $\eta\aleph$, *testimony*, Is. viii. 16), and that in the sense of instruction, warning, correction, (see Jer. vi. 10), not in the sense of comforting by promises. See below, next clause of this verse, on the words that *I may comfort thee*. [While the word signifies prophetic testimony, to bear witness in behalf of God, it may signify divine testimony either for or against a person, and here the former is intimated both by the construction (see critical note below), and by the following words that *I may comfort thee*. Besides the Prophet was actually testifying against the people in the name and by the Spirit of God. But He received no favorable message in their behalf. There is an allusion to ver. 9, "her prophets also find no vision from Jehovah."—W. H. H.] **What thing shall I liken to thee—What liken to thee,—O thou daughter of Jerusalem? What shall I equal to thee—what compare to thee,—that I may comfort thee, O virgin daughter of Zion?** It is a comfort for the unfortunate to know that others have endured equal suffering. This comfort cannot be given to Zion. The idea of comforting can be referred to all three of the preceding verbs, although to *testify* $\eta\aleph$, never means prophesying in order to comfort and make happy, but has always the sense of warning, correction: yet even warning, correction and instruction may be a comfort. [Where this Hebrew verb occurs in the sense of warning or protest it is always connected with its object by the

significant preposition $\aleph$ or $\aleph$. Here the word may be taken simply in the sense of bearing witness, in which sense it is favorably used (even in Hiphil) in Job xxix. 11, see also Mal. ii. 14. The meaning is, What can I, as a prophet of God and in the name of God, testify for God in thy behalf, in order to comfort thee? WORDSWORTH: "What prophetic testimony shall I utter in God's name, in order to console thee? I have no message of comfort for thee; and thy misery is so great, that I can find no likeness or parallel to it, wherewith to assuage thy sorrow."—W. H. II.]—**For thy breach is great like the sea—for great as the sea is thy ruin, or injury; who can heal thee?**

That is to say, Zion's hurt is immeasurable, and incurable. [BLAYNEY: "The breach or wound, which Jerusalem had received, is by an hyperbole said to be *great, deep or wide, like the sea*, which is, as it were, a breach made in the earth." HENDERSON: "He cannot find any object to put in parallel with the lamentable condition of Jerusalem. The only exception is *the sea*, which, on account of its vast dimensions, alone furnished a fit emblem of the magnitude of the devastation effected by the Chaldeans." ASSEM. ANN.: "Such a breach, as not some small river, but the sea is wont to make, when it hath rent asunder and got thorow the sea-walls, that before kept it out; such as cannot be made up again. See Jer. li. 42; Ez. xxvi. 3; Job xxx. 14." CALMET: *Un océan de maux, un déluge de douleurs, une mer d'affliction*, A sea of miseries, a flood of troubles, an ocean of sorrow.]

Ver. 14. **Thy prophets have seen vain and foolish things for thee. Thy prophets foretold to thee deceit and white-wash. [Thy prophets prophesied to thee falsehood and delusion. The last word ($\eta\aleph$) has been variously translated, though NÆGELSBACH alone can claim the unique and parabolical idea expressed by *white-wash*. This meaning is suggested by the use of the word in Ez. xiii. 10-15; xxii. 28, rendered in our version *untempered mortar*. Whether Ezekiel meant white-wash, or not, which is doubtful, the word can have no such meaning here. To daub a wall with white-wash is feasible. To prophesy white-wash is impossible. The Hebrew word ($\eta\aleph$) seems to have suggested the idea of something *viscous, sticky, slimy*; hence applied to *lime, mortar*, as by Ezekiel; or to the white of an egg (Job vi. 6), from which comes the idea of *insipidity, want of savor*, which is the sense adopted in our text by BROUGHTON: *The prophets have looked out for thee things vain and which have lost the saltiness*, and by CALVIN, *insulsiatum, vel insipidum, tastelessness or insipidity*; this sense easily suggests the idea of *folly*, in which sense the word in our text is rendered by most of the versions; SEPT.: ἀποσύννυ; VULG.: stulta; LUTHER: thörichte Gesichte; E. V.: foolish things. The word as thus used would imply more than mere *absurdity*, which is the sense BLAYNEY and BOOTHROYD give it. It means a *folly* that is chargeable with *guilt*, in which sense the cognate word $\eta\aleph$ is used in Job i. 22 (see BARNES' Notes), xxiv. 12: a folly especially that is deceptive, that does not fulfil the expectations it excites, in which sense the same word $\eta\aleph$ is applied to false prophets in Jer. xxiii. 13.—We have not in English a word that will express both these ideas,—delusive folly or foolish delusions. GERLACH uses the word Blend-werk, *false-show, delusion*, but acknowledges that it expresses only the effect, and not the contemptible character of what the pro-**

phets did. The word *stuff*, adopted by HENDERSON, "thy prophets see for thee vanity and stuff," is hardly equivalent to the Hebrew word. He borrowed it from GATAKER, who says, "They took upon them to be seers, but saw not what they should see, and told what they saw not, nothing but vain and frivolous stuff, the froth of their own fancies, Jer. xxiii. 16, 26; xxvii. 14, 15."—W. H. H.] The expression *חֲזוֹן שָׁוְיָא* [*saw vain things*; E. V., *prophesied falsehood*], is found five times in Ezekiel and only in Ezekiel, xiii. 6, 7, 23; xxi. 34 [E. V. 29], xxii. 28. The expression *הִפְלָה* [E. V., here, *foolish things*, in Ezek., *untempered mortar*], is also Ezekiel's, for it is used by him emphatically four times, in the same chapter that contains the phrase (*חֲזוֹן שָׁוְיָא*) just referred to, xiii. 10, 11, 14, 15; and it is used again by him, and that, too, in immediate connection with the same phrase (*חֲזוֹן שָׁוְיָא*) in xxii. 28. The thirteenth chapter of Ezekiel is directed against the false prophets. Ezekiel in that denunciatory discourse has before his eyes what Jeremiah had said relative to the same subject (chap. xxiii.). Now in Jer. xxiii. 13 occurs the expression *הַנְּבִיאִים*, *in the prophets of Samaria I saw the folly* [E. V., *folly*, marg., *an unsavory, or an absurd thing*]. *הִפְלָה* [the word in our text] never occurs in Jeremiah. Besides here, it occurs only in Ezekiel at the places above cited, and in Job vi. 6. For its meaning see the thorough discussion of HAEVERNICK in his *Comm.* on Ezekiel. The whole passage in which Ezekiel uses the expression *הִפְלָה* in the sense of *white-wash*, and to which xxii. 28 afterwards refers, bears throughout the peculiar characteristics of Ezekiel's metaphorical style. We cannot, therefore, doubt that Ez. xiii. was written earlier than our chapter: and also that the words from *נְבִיאֵי חֲזוֹן שָׁוְיָא* originated from the above cited places of Ezekiel. See the Introduction, § 3. [The inference contained in the Introduction and implied here, that if this is a quotation from Ezekiel, Jeremiah could not be the author of the Lamentations, is entirely gratuitous. The thirteenth chapter of Ezekiel must have been written before the final destruction of Jerusalem; "about five years" before "Jerusalem was taken and destroyed," according to WORDSWORTH. Even if the prophecy of Ezekiel had been nearly or quite contemporaneous with the destruction of Jerusalem, it is a mere assumption, incapable of proof, that Jeremiah could not have possessed a copy of that prophecy, even if we are obliged to believe that he wrote these lamentations immediately after the destruction of the city. With the close intercourse that must have subsisted at the time between Babylonia and Palestine, with an invading army constantly flowing in and meeting detachments guarding captives and spoils going out, and with the lively sympathy that must have existed between Ezekiel and Jeremiah, and between the pious Jews in exile and the pious Jews in Judea, it would be neither impossible nor unlikely that the utterances of those prophets should be interchanged as rapidly as they were committed to

writing.—In point of fact, however, it is by no means clear that this passage is a quotation from Ezekiel. As to the first expression, it is composed of two words only, both in frequent use in the earlier Scriptures and in the prophets who preceded Jeremiah. And as to the second, it is used in a connection entirely different from that in which it occurs in Ezekiel, and very obviously in a different sense. How prophesying *הִפְלָה* could be suggested by daubing a wall with *הִפְלָה*, it is difficult to see. How the word can mean the same thing in both places, is also beyond the power of ordinary perception. There would be as much propriety in giving the word the meaning of *white-wash* or *mortar* in Job vi. 6 as here. This is no more a quotation from Ezekiel, than Ezekiel's use of the word is a quotation from Job. —W. H. H.]—**And they have not discovered thine iniquity, to turn away thy captivity**—*And uncovered not thy guilt, to turn thy captivity* [i. e., to prevent it, or avert it. So the Syr. translates it.] The expression, *turn thy captivity*, founded on Deut. xxx. 3, is frequent in Jeremiah (see xxxii. 44; xxxiii. 7, etc.), and with Ezekiel (xvi. 53; xxix. 14, etc.). But in the connection in which it here occurs, it does not mean, as it does in the places referred to, *vertere captivitatem*, i. e., *reducere captivos* [turn the captivity, i. e., bring back the captives], but can only mean *averte captivitatem* [avert, or prevent the captivity]. By open exhortations to repentance, the prophets would have averted the captivity (see Ez. xxii. 30, 31). The words are connected with what precedes. [ASSEM. ANN.: "They laid not thy sins before thee, to bring thee to repentance, whereby thy present miseries might have been prevented, Jer. vi. 13, 14; viii. 11; xxxiii. 17, 22." GERLACH and others understand this to mean that, after the captivity was a fact, the prophets had not led the people to a repentance that would have delivered them from it, see Ps. xiv. 7; Job xlii. 10; Jer. xxx. 18. But this sense would not be pertinent here. Our text looks back to one of the original causes of the present misery. What her prophets might have done to prevent it, they cannot now do, even if by doing it they could terminate that misery; for now her prophets can find no vision from Jehovah, ver. 9. If they had exercised their power aright when they possessed it, the captivity would have been averted. This is the idea now in the Poet's mind.—W. H. H.]—**But have seen for thee false burdens and causes of banishment.**—*And they foretold to thee sayings of deceit and of seduction. [But then they saw for thee burdens of falsehood and expulsions.*—W. H. H.] The connecting thought is, *And so prophesied they, etc.*—**False burdens**—*oracles of deceit*, *חֲזוֹן שָׁוְיָא*, are declarations of delusory purport, which result not felicitously, but ruinously.—**Causes of banishment**, *seductions*, *מְרִיחִים*, can signify, ambiguously indeed, either seductions or banishments. Both predicates may refer to the discourses of the false prophets. LUTHER makes the last feature only conspicuous. "But they have preached to thee wantonly, in that they have preached thee out of the land." THENIUS rightly draws attention to the fact that Jeremiah, xxvii. 10, 15, in a passage where he

warns of the false prophets, expresses emphatically and exactly the same thought which is contained in our verse, "Hearken not ye to your prophets * * * for they prophesy a lie unto you, to remove you far from your land; and that I should drive you out (הִדַּחְתִּי אֹתְכֶם), comp. ver.

15, לֹכֵץ הָרִיץ אֹתְכֶם), and ye should perish." It is therefore very possible that the Poet, by the choice of this word, seemingly invented *ad hoc* for his present purpose, would give us to understand that he had in view not only the declarations of Ezekiel, but also those of Jeremiah pertaining to this matter. Thus the verb נָחַץ [from which the Hebrew noun is derived] is, as seen from the examples adduced, especially current with Jeremiah. It is found in this prophet nineteen times, elsewhere in the old Testament thirty-four times, ten of which are in Deuteronomy. But that it may be used here ambiguously, its connection with נָחַץ indicates. [There are three objections

to the translation of NÆGELSBACH. 1. It makes the last clause of the verse a mere repetition of the first clause. 2. It is very doubtful if the last word, rendered *seduction* (NOYES, *seductions*), can have that meaning. WORDSWORTH gives its literal meaning as *drivings away*, and explains it consistently with the general idea adopted by our author, "the prophecies of thy false prophets, to which thou didst hearken, instead of listening to God, have banished thee, and driven thee away from thy home." 3. The word rendered by NÆGELSBACH, WORDSWORTH, NOYES and others, *prophecies*, and in E. V. *burdens*, cannot mean any prophecy, without reference to its subject or character, but designates a prophecy of a threatening or minatory nature. The correct translation then is, *But they saw for thee burdens of vanity and expulsions or banishments*. But how could this be true of the false prophets? HENGSTENBERG (on Zech. i. 9) understands the *vain burdens and exiles or dispersions*, which the false prophets predicted as referring to the enemy. "The false prophets endeavor to make themselves beloved by the people, by predicting a great calamity, which should come upon their powerful oppressors." (So also DIODATI.) The objection to this is that it does not naturally follow the second clause of the verse, and is, after all, only a repetition of the first clause. HENDERSON takes the word *burdens* as meaning the *causes of punishments*, as our version has rendered the last word *causes of banishment*. "The false prophets, in their attempts to account for the captivity, invented any one but the true one,—the apostasy of the Jews." This preserves the logical connection between the three clauses of the verse, but is philologically untenable, for the idea of *causes of punishment* is not suggested by the words used. The probable explanation is suggested by the use of the future with ! conversive, which, while it makes the verb a preterite, suggests a time posterior to that to which the preceding preterites referred. Her prophets having predicted vain and foolish things, and failed to bring the people to repentance, and so save them from captivity, then at last, after the captivity occurred, themselves predicted for her burdens of misfortune and of banishments. Those very prophets who

once prophesied so many things full of flattery, overwhelmed and panic-stricken in the hour of calamity, see nothing but evil for the daughter of Zion, and were loudest in their predictions of punishments and misfortunes. This would agree with the interpretation already given to the words in ver. 9. *Her prophets also find no vision from Jehovah, i. e., no vision of good, of blessing, they have only visions of evils, prophetic burdens full of apprehensions and fears*. Another explanation suggests itself from the double meaning of the verb to see, רָאָה, which may mean merely to see, or to see by prophetic inspiration. It may be taken in the former sense, with a satirical purpose. These prophets did see prophetically, or pretended to do so, visions from God that were vain and delusory, but they afterwards actually saw in course of fulfilment the *burdens of misfortune and banishment* pronounced by Jeremiah and formerly derided by them. The use of the word נָחַץ, if it necessarily means *false* (though it may possibly mean simply *misfortune*, see Job vii. 3; Is. xxx. 28; Hos. xii. 12), would be a valid objection to the last interpretation, but not to the other, for in that case the *burdens* were *false burdens*, suggested by their own excited and terrified imaginations. The force of the future with ! conversive, following verbs in the preterite, may be expressed here thus, *but then, i. e., after the captivity, they saw false burdens and expulsions*.—W. H. H.]

The thought is entirely Jeremicac. See ii. 8; xiv. 13-15; xxvii. 14-16, etc. In Lamentations it occurs only once again, iv. 13.—[נָחַץ]. After all that has been asserted to the contrary, the evidence from its derivation and use is, that this word means simply a *burden*, and, as applied to prophecies, an announcement of punishment or vengeance imposed on its object as a burden. The verb נָחַץ never means to pronounce, except in a figurative sense, as if the voice were lifted up in loud outcries or shouting: and its derivative נָחַץ is not used in a single instance where it can only mean a simple declaration or announcement, or where we cannot trace at least a figurative allusion to something that is borne or carried as a burden. It is used twenty-four times of a literal material burden (Num. iv. 15, 19, 24, 27 twice, 31, 32, 47, 49; 2 Kings v. 17; viii. 9; 2 Chron. xvii. 11; xx. 25; xxxv. 3; Neh. xiii. 15, 19; Is. xxii. 25; xxx. 6; xlv. 1, 2; Jer. xvii. 21, 22, 24, 27); ten times of a literal mental burden or care (Num. xi. 11, 17; Deut. i. 12; 2 Sam. xv. 33; xix. 36; 2 Kings ix. 25; 2 Chron. xxiv. 27; Job vii. 20; Ps. xxxviii. 5; Ez. xxiv. 25); twice where it seems to refer to *usury* laid as a burden on the unfortunate (Neh. v. 7, 10), once for punishment as a *burden* (Hos. viii. 10), twenty-four times with reference to prophecies that may fairly be regarded as of a minatory character, laying *burdens* on their objects (Is. xiii. 1; xiv. 28; xv. 1; xvii. 1; xix. 1; xxi. 1, 11, 13; xxii. 1; xxiii. 1; Jer. xxiii. 33 twice, 34, 36 twice, 38 thrice; Ezek. xii. 10; Nah. i. 1. Hab. i. 1; Zech. ix. 1; xii. 1; Mal. i. 1), three times where it is translated by E. V. *song*, and in the margin *carriage*, where the idea of the care of religious services involves the idea of a *burden*

(1 Chron. xv. 22 *twice*, 27), and twice where it may mean a solemn charge laid as a burden on those to whom it is given (Prov. xxx. 1; xxxi. 1). A careful examination of these passages, the only ones except our text where the word oc-

curs, will strongly confirm the opinion that *כִּשֶׁה* never means simply *effatum*, a declaration, an ordinary oracle or prophecy, but always one implying a *burden* of evil foretold or imprecated.—W. H. H.]

II. 15, 16.

15 All that pass by clap *their* hands at thee; they hiss and wag their head at the daughter of Jerusalem, *saying*, Is this the city that *men* call The perfection of beauty, The joy of the whole earth? All thine enemies have opened their mouth against thee: they hiss and gnash the teeth: they say, We have swallowed *her* up: certainly this *is* the day that we looked for; we have found, we have seen *it*.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 15.—כִּפְקִי וְנִי. Num. xxiv. 10; Job xxvii. 23. See Jer. xxxi. 19 (Ez. xxi. 17); xlviii. 26.—Jer. nowhere uses the expression שָׂרַק רָאשׁ. He says instead הִנִּיד בְּרָאשׁ, xviii. 16, comp. Ps. xlv. 15.—The *ו*, *relativum*, which is used here, and in ver. 16, evidently because words from the common colloquial dialect are quoted, occurs in Lam. only in these two verses and in iv. 19; v. 18, and not at all in Jer. The *Prim. rel.* must be regarded as in the accusative of the nearer relation (in reference to whom they said it, see my *Gr.*, §70, *c. f.*), since אָבַר never directly means to *call* (see Is. v. 20; viii. 12; Eccles. ii. 2). The Imperfect here indicates repetition in past times; see on אָבַר, ver. 12.—כָּלִילֵת. This word-form and its variations are frequent in Ezekiel (see xvi. 14; xxiii. 12; xxxviii. 4; xxvii. 24); Jeremiah never uses them. See Ps. l. 2, מְכַלֵּל יְפִי is mentioned as going out of Zion.—Jeremiah (xlix. 25) and Ezekiel (xxiv. 25) use מְשׁוּשׁ by itself, each only once.

Ver. 16.—With reference to the transposition of the initial letters *נ* and *פ* in chaps. ii., iii., iv., see the *Intr.*—Jeremiah never uses פָּצַח: in Ez. it is found once, ii. 8.—שָׂרַק. See ver. 15.—The verb חָרַק occurs only in Job xvi. 9; Ps. xxxvii. 12; xxxv. 16; cxii. 10, and is used only of grinding the teeth, gnashing with the teeth. בָּלַעְנוּ, vers. 2, 5, 8.—Jer. often uses the Piel בָּקַח, viii. 15 (xiv. 19); xiii. 16; xiv. 22: it is not found in Ezekiel.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

In these verses the Poet depicts the scornful triumph of heathen and inimical nations over the ruin of Jerusalem. [SCOTT: "The idolaters took the words out of the mouth of the Jews, and derided them for glorying in their holy city and its peculiar protection and privileges. The combination of scorn, enmity, rage and exultation, which the conquerors and spectators manifested, when gratified by the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, are set before the reader with peculiar pathos and energy. The whole scene is presented to his view as in some exquisitely finished historical painting: and the insulting multitudes, who surrounded the Redeemer's cross, can hardly be forgotten on the occasion."]

Ver. 15. All that pass by clap their hands at thee; they hiss and wag their head.—*They clap their hands over thee all who pass by the way. They hiss and shake their head. [All that passed by the way clapped their hands at thee, they hissed and wagged their head.* OWEN: "Jeremiah relates what had taken place, the verbs being in the past tense. Our version is not correct in rendering the verbs in the present tense. The old versions follow the Hebrew."—W. H. H.] Some (OTTO, THENIUS) interpret this verse as the expression, not of mockery, but of amazement. They say not *all* who passed by would have mocked. That may be. But the number

who would not was certainly decreasingly small.

For by the עֹבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ, *passers of the way*, we must understand travellers and strangers. The Israelites were no longer in that empty land, and if there were some, yet to them the destruction of the city was only too well known. But clapping the hands is a gesture especially of surprise. Besides, it is further said, that they *hiss*. The Hebrew verb שָׂרַק signifies, it is true, primarily to whistle, and does not always express scorn and mockery (see Is. v. 26; vii. 18). שָׂרַק with ל, Is. v. 26; vii. 18; Zech. x. 8, does not express scorn and mockery, but with עַל it always does, 1 Kings ix. 8; Job xxvii. 23; Jer. xix. 8; xlix. 17; l. 13; Ez. xxvii. 36; Zeph. ii. 15. We whistle to a person to call his attention, but to whistle at or over a person implies derision.—W. H. H.] But the connection here decidedly favors the sense of 'scornful hissing.' For שָׂרַק, to hiss, must be taken in the same sense in which it is immediately used in the next verse, which is closely connected with this verse. There it undoubtedly has this sense. Add to this, that the shaking of the head is always an expression of scornful wonderment; Ps. xxii. 8; cix. 25; Job xvi. 4; Is. xxxvii. 22 (2 Kings xix. 21).—At the daughter of Jerusalem. See ver. 13. [Mark the distinction between *thee* in the first clause, and *the daughter of Jerusalem* in the second clause. In the first chapter the city itself is pro-

minent and foremost, and Zion appears as an accessory to her past grandeur, once her crowning glory, but now in ruins, the cause of her deepest disgrace and anguish. In this chapter the relations of the two are reversed. Zion here stands forth in ideal personification as the conspicuous figure, and the city, the daughter of Jerusalem, once her chief honor and her joy, is now the chiefest cause of her shame and grief.—W. H. H.]—**Saying, Is this the city that men call—Is that the city of which it used to be said.—The perfection of beauty—Perfect in beauty.** The expression is borrowed from Ezekiel, xxvii. 3, where the prophet so calls the city of Tyre, and xxviii. 12, where he indicates the king of Tyre as “perfect in beauty.”—**The joy of the whole earth.** This expression is used of Zion in Ps. xlviii. 3. [ALEXANDER: “It is called the joy of the whole earth, as a source of spiritual blessing to all nations.”] See Is. xxiv. 11. Jerusalem is called the joy of the whole earth, and not merely of the whole land [*i. e.*, the land of Israel (OWEN)], as is evident, because that which is *perfect in beauty* must be all this, and because all the strangers and travellers passing by it are represented as moved at first with astonishment. Joy at her beauty can be reconciled with envy and hatred of her inhabitants.

Ver. 16. This verse enters into very close connection with the preceding one. It treats of the same malicious rejoicings of the enemies over the downfall of Jerusalem. But it proceeds farther in its statements, for while in ver. 15 only *the passers-by*, in ver. 16 *all* her enemies are represented as rejoicing and exulting.—**All thine enemies opened their mouth against thee.**

All thine enemies gape their mouth at thee [lit., *All of thy enemies opened at thee wide their mouth*]. The gaping, or distorting of the mouth, in behoof of scornful laughter, is indicated again in iii. 46, where these words are almost verbally repeated, and with the expressions here used in Ps. xxii. 14.—**They hiss** [lit., *they hissed*] see ver. 15—and **gnash** [lit., *gnashed*] **the teeth.** As this is elsewhere an expression of suppressed rage, so here it is an expression of satisfied rage. See Ps. xxxv. 16, 21, 25.—**They say** [lit., *said*], **we have swallowed her up—we have devoured** [*i. e.*, completely destroyed]. Not only those enemies who had personally taken an active part in the destruction of Jerusalem, are intended, but all had a share in what some actually achieved,—so far, at least, that all could say, “We have destroyed.”—**Certainly this is the day that we looked for—Yea, this is the day we have expected.** It is evident that the restriction involves an assertion; if only *this* day (as the day of total destruction), and no other, could afford satisfaction to the enemies, then certainly that day afforded satisfaction in the highest degree. See Jer. x. 19.—**We have found, we have seen it.**—**Finding,** מִצָּאָה, is the antithesis to *seeking, striving.* **Seeing,** רָאָה, which involves the idea of certainty on the ground of seeing with the bodily eyes (see Ps. iv. 7; lxxxv. 8), is the antithesis to merely *wishing and hoping.* The heaping together of words arranged *asyndetically* [*we have looked for, we have found, we have seen,*—the original can hardly fail to remind us of the famous *Veni, vidi, vici*] portrays the intensity and the completeness of their satisfaction.

II. 17.

- 17 The LORD hath done *that* which he had devised; he hath fulfilled his word that he had commanded in the days of old: he hath thrown down, and hath not pitied: and he hath caused *thine* enemy to rejoice over thee: he hath set up the horn of thine adversaries.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 17.—**עָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר וָכֵם.** See Deut. xix. 19.—The verb **פָּעַע** in Jer. only in Kal and in the connection **פָּעַע פָּעַע**, vi. 13; viii. 10. In the sense of *absolvere, filling up*, it is found Is. x. 12; Zech. iv. 9.—**אָמְרָה** is found no where else in the Old Testament. The form **אָמְרָה**, once very frequent, especially in Ps. cxix., is found neither in Jer. nor Ez.—Piel **צִיָּה** Jer. uses very frequently.—**כִּי־יִיָּה**, see i. 7.—Piel **שָׁפַח**, twice in Jer.; in Lam. only here.—**יָרִים קֶרֶן**. This expression is not found in Jer.; he only once uses the word **קֶרֶן**, see on ver. 3.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. [In ver. 17 the direct address to Zion is resumed, and is continued through vers. 18, 19.—W. H. H.] The ruin of Zion, as above described, was not a fortuitous event. God had for a long time foreseen and decreed it as eventually inevitable. Hence the historical catastrophe is nothing else than a realization of a divine purpose. It was, then, God Himself who destroyed the holy city and afforded to her enemies the rejoicings of which vers. 15, 16 speak. To

those verses this verse refers throughout.—**The Lord hath done that which he had devised** *Jehovah accomplished what He had decreed.* See Jer. li. 12, “for Jehovah hath both devised and done that which He spake.” Zech. i. 6 expands the same thought by the emphatic expression of the middle term, “Like as Jehovah of hosts thought to do unto us, according to our ways, and according to our doings, so hath He dealt with us.” [HENDERSON: “However the enemies of the Jews might tauntingly exult in their destruction of the Jewish metropolis, that disastrous event was ultimately to be referred to the purpose of

Jehovah to punish its inhabitants for their sins "] —**He hath fulfilled his word that he had commanded in the days of old.** The Lord had, in very ancient times, when He founded the Theocracy, commanded His servants to warn His people that in case of disobedience they would have to suffer the punishment of destruction. See Lev. xxvi. 14-39; Deut. xxviii. 15-68. [SCOTT: "This reference to the ancient predictions against Israel for their sins, is of great importance; both as it shows that these prophecies were then extant and well known among the Jews, and that they were understood by the pious remnant exactly as we now explain them."—BLAYNEY, followed by BOOTHROYD, divides the verse thus: *Jehovah hath accomplished that which he had devised; he hath fulfilled his word; what he constituted in days of old, he hath destroyed and not spared; and says, "To this construction we are determined by the metre. The sense is good,*

and perfectly adapted to the place, and corresponds nearly with what is expressed Jer. xlv. 4." All this is true. But, on the whole, the Hebrew accents rather favor the common division, the metre does not demand the change, and the repetition of the pronoun אֲשֶׁר directly before its governing verb has a poetical and rhythmical effect, according to the common division, not to be overlooked.—W. H. H.]—**He hath thrown down—He demolished, or destroyed.—And hath not pitied—And pitied not.** See ver. 2.—**And he hath caused thine enemy to rejoice over thee—He made the enemy joyful over thee.** [CALVIN: *exhilarated their enemies.*].—**He hath set up the horn of thine adversaries—He exalted the horn of thine oppressors.** This expression is purely poetical. See in particular 1 Sam. ii. 10; Ps. lxxv. 11; xcii. 11; cxlviii. 14; 1 Chron. xxv. 5.

II. 18, 19.

- 18 Their heart cried unto the Lord, O wall of the daughter of Zion, let tears run down like a river day and night: give thyself no rest; let not the apple of thine
19 eye cease. Arise, cry out in the night; in the beginning of the watches pour out thine heart like water before the face of the Lord; lift up thy hands toward him for the life of thy young children, that faint for hunger in the top of every street.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 18.—חֹכֶמֶת. BOERMAL would altogether erase this word. HOUBIGANT reads: אֲדֹנִי אֶל-בְּתוּלַת בַּת צִי. HERDER: חֲפֹז [or חֲכֹמֶת], i. e., *exardescere* [*Servido zelo corripere*. So BLAYNEY: *Their heart cried out, before Jehovah with fervency, O, etc.*]. DATHE, after the Syriac: אֶל-אֲדֹנִי חֹמֹת בַּת צִי. J. D. MICHAELIS: אֲדֹנִי for אֲדֹנִי, i. e., *clamat cor eorum ob fundamenta murorum. Tu filia Zion descendere fac, etc.* THENIUS would read חָנָם instead of חֹכֶמֶת. EWALD, in his later editions, reads לִבֶּךָ צַעֲקִי לִבֶּךָ. He compares Ps. lxxii. 2, and translates, *inde fatigably cry to Jehovah, O wall of the daughter of Zion!* The reading חֹכֶמֶת, however, is confirmed by the SEPT. For this translates, Ἐβοήσα καρδία αὐτῶν πρὸς κύριον: Τεῖχος ὧν καταγάγετο ὡς χειμάρρους δάκρυα, etc. JEROME does not change the text, but he translates, *Clamavit cor eorum ad Dominum super muros filie Zion.*—The verb פָּנַן in the sense *torpidum, languidum esse*, Niph. *examinatum, enervatum esse*, Gen. xlv. 26; IIab. i. 4; Ps. lxxvii. 3; xxxviii. 9. The substantive פִּנְיָה occurs only here: הִפְנִיָה iii. 49. The construction לִבֶּךָ פָּנַן is a very strong, perhaps the strongest, example of the use of the construct case for the mere purpose of the external connection of words. See Ew., §287, d, 2; 289, h רָכַם is used here in the general sense of *cessare*. See Josh. x. 12, 13; Jer. xlvii. 6.
Ver. 19.—קָנִי. See Jer. ii. 27; xiii. 4, 6; xviii. 2.—רָגִי. See Jer. xxxi. 7; Prov. i. 20.—בְּלִילִי. See i. 2.—לְרֹאשׁ־נְחִיָּה, an expression only found here.—נִחֵה כְּנִי. See Jer. xvii. 16.—[אֲדֹנִי. HENDERSON: "Instead of *Adonai* forty of KENNICOTT's, and forty-eight of DE ROSSI's MSS., together with seven more of his originally, and the Hagiographa printed at Naples, read *Jehovah*. The Venetian Greek version has τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. On these authorities I have not scrupled to follow this reading in the translation." BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, NOYES, adopt this reading.—W. H. H.]—שָׁאִי כָּפֶךָ, not in Jeremiah.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **Their heart cried unto the Lord.**—The first words of ver. 18 have given the commentators great trouble. Various readings have been invented. I believe that neither a different reading, nor an artful construction is necessary. Only we must not regard the words, *Their hearts cried unto the Lord*, as an independent sentence (LUECKENBUESSER, THENIUS) thrown in by the way. Rather, these words constitute the introduction and means of transition to all that fol-

lows down to the end of the chapter. First of all, let it be observed, from the second clause of ver. 18, the Poet lets Zion herself speak with reference to what he had been saying in vers. 13-17. This change in the method of recital he precedes with the brief word of introduction above indicated. But what he now puts into the mouth of Zion, as an outpouring of the heart to Jehovah, he divides into two parts. First of all, in vers. 18 b, 19, they to whom the pronoun *their* (the suffix in לְבָבְךָ, *their heart*) refers address the wall and summon it to prayer. In vers. 20-22

the prayer itself follows, which accordingly must be regarded as the prayer of the wall of Zion. They of whom it is said, *Their heart cries unto the Lord*, are evidently particular individuals. But these persons would not appear before God in their individual capacities, but rather seek the mediation (der idealen Gesamtheit) of the whole church, regarded in its ideal or mystical unity. Thus the cry of their heart comes to God through the mouth (der Gesamtheit) of the united people [theoretically and by personification regarded as a unit]. Thus it is explained why the words, *Their heart cried unto the Lord*, are not immediately followed by words addressed to God, but by an appeal to the wall of Zion, which by answering this appeal brings before the Lord that which filled *their heart*, as mentioned in ver. 18 a. That those individuals should thus seek the mediation of the whole church (Gesamtheit) is very natural. For not the individual Israelite, but Israel is the universally historic reservoir and organ of the redeeming grace of God. With Israel is the covenant of grace made, and only as covenant members of Israel have individuals any claim on covenant grace. Now, therefore, as in the Psalms (cxxxv. 19; cxlvii. 12; cxlix. 1-3, etc.) the congregation is often summoned to offer praise and thanks to the Lord, so here it is summoned to make its complaint to the Lord. If this is done here in a very peculiar fashion, by summoning to prayer the wall of Zion as if it were the symbol of the theocratic unity (der Gesamtheit), yet this is justified by the historical circumstances out of which our Song originated. Zion stood as long as the walls held together. But as soon as these were broken through, Zion was lost (see Jer. lii. 7, *והפסק עיר* then the city was broken up). Is it surprising that an Israelite, who had experienced the siege and capture of Jerusalem, should take the wall for all that it enclosed? This trope is, on the whole, no more bold, than where elsewhere the frontiers are taken for the country they bound, the house for its inhabitants, the purse for its contents. The pre-eminent importance of the wall may be clearly perceived from the fact that in Nehemiah's time everything depended on its restoration. See Neh. vi. 15, 16; xii. 27-43; comp. Ps. cxxii. 3. If the wall of the daughter of Zion is thus taken for the daughter of Zion herself, it should not surprise us that the same activities are attributed to the wall which belong properly to the daughter of Zion, and that it is exhorted to weep and to pray for its children. Mourning and exhaustion have already been attributed to it in ver. 8 above, and in i. 4 the ways of Zion are represented as mourning. Further, Is. iii. 26 and xiv. 31 have been correctly referred to, where the predicates of mourning, lamenting and howling are imputed to the gates. [The first words of the verse must refer to the enemies who are the subject of the preceding verse. There is no other nominative expressed to which the pronoun *their* (the suffix in *לָבָן*) can belong. To refer it back to the *passer-by* in ver. 15, as BLAYNEY does, is unnecessary and unnatural. To suppose that it refers to the pious Jews is to suppose an abrupt ungrammatical, and awkward transition, to which there is no parallel in the Lamentations. The

pronominal suffixes in these Songs are employed with singular accuracy. If we keep in mind the proper meaning of the verb rendered *cried*, which is to *cry out*, to *vociferate* (Deut. xxii. 24, 27; Is. xlii. 2), we readily see the connection. Even these heathen enemies recognized the hand of God in the destruction of Jerusalem, and *their heart* expressed this conviction in loud outcries and shouts addressed to *the Lord*,—*Adonai* the Lord of the heathen, as well as of Israel. This may throw additional light on the words in ver. 7, "They have made a noise in the house of Jehovah, as in the day of a solemn feast." (It is not impossible that the choice of a proper initial word may have led to this continued reference to the heathen.) After the word *Lord* there ought to be a full stop. This is indicated in the Hebrew by the accent *Aathnah*, which rarely occurs so near the beginning of a verse. What follows is not *what the enemies cried*, nor indeed can it be, for the Hebrew word so translated is intransitive. Whenever that word, *קָרָא* is followed by anything spoken or said, the verb *קָרָא*, to say, is introduced, Ex. v. 8, *they cry, saying*: 16, xvii. 4; Num. xii. 13; 2 Kings iv. 1; vi. 26, *cried—saying*: 1 Kings xx. 39; 2 Kings iv. 40; vi. 5, *cried—and said*. The only seeming exception to this construction, 2 Kings ii. 12, where Elisha *cried, My father, my father!* etc., is due, probably, to the broken disconnected ejaculations of the prophet, that could hardly be preceded by the verb *קָרָא*, as if he had said something with deliberation. It must be observed, too, that they were only ejaculations, outcries that he uttered, and the verb is not followed by *אֵל* as it is here. But here, where *אֵל* is used, a long and connected address, like this to the walls of Zion, could not be the object of the verb *קָרָא*, to cry. Had the prophet intended to tell us what the enemies said to God, he would have followed the word *קָרָא*, *they cried* with the usual phrase *and said*. We must take therefore the following touching address to the walls, as the words of the Prophet. We thus avoid the exceeding awkwardness of introducing a long address to the walls of the city with the singular announcement that *they cried to the Lord*, when there is not, according to NAEGLSBACH, a single word actually addressed to *the Lord*, for the prayer in verses 20-22 is the prayer of Zion. We moreover dispense with the necessity of the laborious distinction between the individual members of the church and the mystical unity of the untranslatable *Gesamtheit*. We have here an eloquent poetical address by the prophet to the ruined walls, which by personification and synecdoche represent the afflicted daughter of Zion.—WORDS-WORTH: "O wall of the daughter of Zion. The Prophet appeals to the wall of Jerusalem, as that which once encircled her with defence, but now lies prostrate, and which, being reduced to ruin, was the fittest representative of the city in her desolate condition. He gives a voice to the stones of the wall, and makes them weep for her sorrow. We need not be surprised by such a prosopopœia as this, any more than by his exclamation, O earth, earth, earth (xxii. 29), or by the language of Hab. ii. 11: *The stone shall cry out*

of the wall, and the beam shall answer it; or by our Lord's words (Luke xix. 40), *If these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out.*" Comp. GERLACH, p. 75.—W. H. H.].—**Let tears run down like a river day and night.** The expression, precisely as it is here, is found no where else. For similar expressions, see iii. 48; Jer. ix. 17; xiii. 17; xiv. 17.—**Give thyself no rest; let not the apple of thine eye cease** [or leave off, i. e., shedding tears (NOYES)]. *The daughter of thine eye.* This expression is found elsewhere only in Ps. xvii. 8. בַּת, daughter, is here apparently an abbreviation of בֵּית, entrance, door, gate, Zech. ii. 12. The pupil is the door, the opening of the eye, because in it lies the power of sight. See FUERST *Lex.*, GESEN. *Thes.*, p. 841. DELITSCH on Ps. xvii. 8. [ASSEM. ANN.: "That which we call the ball, or apple of the eye, from the spherical figure of it, that the Hebrews call the daughter of the eye, either as the dearest and tenderest part of it, Deut. xxxii. 10; Prov. vii. 2, or from the figures that seem to appear in it, whence also it is termed by the Greeks the *damsel*, by the Latins the *babe* of the eye." See Deut. xxxii. 10; Prov. vii. 2, and ALEXANDER on Ps. xvii. 8. BLAYNEY understands the tear as so called "with great propriety and elegance;" but this is supported by no evidence, and is rendered improbable by analogous terms applied to the pupil of the eye, by Hebrews, Greeks and Romans, as indicated above.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 19. **Arise, Rise up.**—[GERLACH: "Up." OWEN: "The meaning as stated by GATAKER, is, *Rise from thy bed*; for she is exhorted to cry in the night. The Hebrew word is familiar and precious to us as the same our Saviour uttered, Mark v. 41. "*Talitha cumi*," κοῦμι, קִמְּי. W. H. H.].—**Cry out in the night, in, or at the beginning of the watches.** The Hebrews divided the night into three watches ["the first, commencing at sunset and extending to what corresponded to our ten o'clock; the second, from ten till two in the morning; and the third from that time till sun rise" (HENDERSON)]:

the middle one was called הַשְּׁמִיטָה הַתְּיִכְנָה, the middle watch, Judges vii. 19; the last אֶשְׁכֵּרֶת הַבֶּקֶר, morning watch, Ex. xiv. 24; 1 Sam. xi. 11. Since in Judges vii. 19 the beginning of the middle watch is called ראשׁ א' ה' [lit., head of middle watch], so ראשׁ אֶשְׁכֵּרֶת [lit., head of night watches], the beginning of the night watches generally, would be the time of the first watch. See WINER, *R. W. B.*, s. v., *Nachtwachen*. [The opinion that this was the name of the first watch, seems to rest entirely on its use here. Yet there is much reason to doubt if it has here that sense. To rise in the first watch of the night, which began before ordinary bed-time, is not very suggestive of sleepless grief and anxiety. The passage in Judges favors GERLACH's conjecture, that the expression denotes the beginning of each successive watch in the night. He refers to the similar use of ראשׁ, head, beginning, in this same verse, and quotes the remark of MICHAELIS, that ראשׁ חֲצִיזָה means, not the first of all the open-places, but the beginning or head of every one of

them. So ראשׁ אֶשְׁכֵּרֶת means not the first of the night watches, but the beginning of each successively. At every watch, or as often as you hear the watchman announce the hour, cry out to God in prayer.—W. H. H.] The preposition used

here in Hebrew, לְ, means towards or about that time (see Gen. iii. 8; viii. 11). The sense is, About the time, when formerly every one resigned himself to his first sleep, the one here addressed should rise up to painful mourning.—**Pour out thine heart like water.** This seems to denote, first of all, the melting, dissolving of the heart by grief (see Ps. xxii. 15; lviii. 8; comp. 1 Sam. vii. 6), and then, the open unreserved outpouring of the heart (see Ps. lxi. 9; xlii. 5; ciii. 1).—**Before the face of the Lord** [Jehovah, see Textual note above].—**Lift up thy hands toward him.** Lift up to him thy hands. See Ps. lxxiii. 5; cxix. 48. [CALVIN: "The elevation of the hands, in this place and others, means the same thing as prayer; and it has been usual in all ages to raise up the hands to Heaven, and the expression often occurs in the Psalms (xxviii. 2; cxxxiv. 2); and when Paul bids prayers to be made every where, he says, 'I would have men to raise up pure hands without contention' (1 Tim. ii. 8)."]—**For the life of thy young children,** lit., for the souls of, etc. As is seen by the words following (that have fainted, etc.), the object of holding up the hands is, not to save the children (ROSENMUELLER), but to mourn over their loss. See at vers. 11, 12. Besides, the children are designated, also, as in the verses just named, not as the only, but as a principal object of lamentation. See vers. 20-22. [GERLACH: "To raise the hands is, according to the fixed use of words, the same thing as to pray, iii. 41; Ps. xxviii. 2; lxxiii. 5; cxxxiv. 2 (see 1 Tim. ii. 8), and therefore cannot be understood, with THENIUS, as a gesture of the deepest distress. If he would confirm this opinion by the fact, that according to the whole train of thought their fate is already determined and can only be mourned over, and therefore an exhortation to pray for the life of the languishing ones would no longer be in place; then we answer, that in that case no prayer in behalf of the city would any longer be proper, for its fate was fulfilled: yet it would be proper for those who are found surviving in great want, as in fact a prayer immediately follows on the thought of this calamity in i. 11, 20: See, Jehovah, how I am distressed. And, further,

עַל-נַפְשׁ [for the soul] does not indicate the already ended life (THENIUS, DE WETTE), for which נַפְשׁ (the life principle) would be a singular expression, and, further still, it would be inconsistent with the descriptions given in ver. 11 and iv. 4, 5, where not the death of those who have fainted, but the distress of those still living, rends the hearts of their mothers." GERLACH's

opinion is confirmed by the words to הָאֱלֹהִים, lift up thy hands to him, i. e., to God in prayer.—W. H. H.].—**That faint for hunger in the top** [lit., at the head] of every street—Who have fainted for hunger at the opening of every street. See iv. 1; Is. li. 20; Nah. iii. 10. That the

wall, in the poet's conception, strictly and only represents Zion, is plainly evident from this, that the Israelitish children are designated as the children of the wall. This could be done with the more propriety from the fact that the wall had a certain motherly character. Did it not embrace the people with its arms? Did it not

truly, in a certain mother-like manner, bear them on its bosom? [WORDSWORTH: "The wall, which girdled Jerusalem, is regarded as a mother, which nurses the inhabitants, her offspring, in her bosom; and she laments for the children which lie at the end of the streets, extending from one side of the city to the other."]

II. 20-22.

20 Behold, O LORD, and consider to whom thou hast done this. Shall the women
eat their fruit and children of a span long? shall the priest and the prophet be
21 slain in the sanctuary of the Lord? The young and the old lie on the ground in
the streets: my virgins and my young men are fallen by the sword: thou hast slain
22 them in the day of thy anger; thou hast killed and not pitied. Thou hast called,
as in a solemn day, my terrors round about; so that in the day of the LORD's
anger none escaped nor remained: those that I have swaddled and brought up hath
mine enemy consumed.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 20.—עוֹלָל. See i. 12; iii. 25.—[אֵם. HENDERSON: "אֵם is twice used in this verse with the force of a demonstrative interjection." He translates, *Behold! women eat their fruit, infants of a span long; Behold! priest and prophet are slain, etc.* This is manifestly wrong. In the very few instances in which אֵם has the force of an interjection, it retains a conditional sense, and never introduces an unqualified affirmation, or statement of an unquestioned matter of fact (see Hos. xii. 12; Job xvii. 13, 16; Prov. iii. 34; Jer. xxxi. 20). Besides, the future form of the verbs requires here a conditional or potential sense.—W. H. H.].—רָחֵם. See ii. 4. [HENDERSON: "The nominative to יִרְחֵם בָּחֵן וְנָבִיא taken singly." The German enables NAEGELSBACH to preserve the Hebrew construction, Soll erwürget werden Priester und Prophet?—W. H. H.]

—כִּי־רָחֵם. See ii. 7.

Ver. 21.—שָׂכָב. Jeremiah uses שָׂכָב only once, in שְׂכָבָה iii. 25; but we find K'ri (decidedly arbitrary) in iii. 2, שְׂכָבָה.—לֹא־רָחֵם. See vers. 2, 10, 11.—חֲנוּצִית. Acc. loc. See my *Gr.*, §70, a, β. ["The accusative is used after verbs of rest, in answer to the question *where?*" NAEGELS. *Gr.*].—יָנַעַר וְנָקַן. See Jer. li. 22.—טָבַחַת. See Jer. xi. 19; xxv. 34; li. 40. The expression seems to involve an antithesis to טָפְחוּם, ver. 20.

Ver. 22.—תִּקְרָא. The imperfect, when compared with the preceding and following perfects, seems to be due entirely to the necessities of the acoustic. [Perhaps, the future here, as in ver. 20, has a conditional or potential sense. So OWEN, who connects it with the words, *See, O Jehovah, and consider.* In this case the following would have the sense of *for*; or as in E. V.: *so that. Shouldst Thou call together, as on a festival, all my terrors from round about! For there was not, etc.* BLAYNEY, in his emendation of the text, overlooks the necessity of a ת initial.—כִּי־מִיָּעַר. See ver. 6.—W. H. H.].—רַב־יָרֵי. Piel not in Jeremiah, nor does he use the verb in this sense. See Ezek. xix. 2.—כָּל־לֵם. See Jer. v. 3; ix. 15; xiv. 12; xlix. 37, etc. [BLAYNEY (followed by BOOTHROYD) takes this word for כָּל with suffix, and translates: *Those whom I had fostered and made to grow were all of them my enemies.* The pointing, כָּל־לֵם not לֵם, the Versions, and the sense, are all against this.—W. H. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The opinion of CHR. B. MICHAELIS (which ROSEN-MUELLER seems to adopt), that the following prayer is set forth by the prophet himself, as a form of prayer (*instar formularis*), in behalf of the daughter of Zion, who is exhorted to pray in vers. 18, 19, hardly needs refutation. That the wall of Zion, i. e., Zion herself, utters the prayer in vers. 20-22, is evident, both from the exhortation to prayer in vers. 18, 19, and from the substantial agreement of vers. 20-22 with what vers. 18, 19 had indicated as the subject matter of this prayer of lamentation.

Ver. 20. Behold, O LORD, and consider—See, O Jehovah, and look. This exact formula occurs i. 11. The prayer in i. 20-22 (comp. i. 9) also begins with *See, Jehovah.*—To whom

thou hast done this. [As the pronoun is interrogative, that form should be preserved: *to whom hast Thou done thus?* The question thus interposed between the appeal to God to look, and the description of what He will see if He look, is very forcible and does not mar the sense as the ordinary construction does, but makes it more apparent.—W. H. H.] The Lord had done this, not to a heathen nation, but to the people of His own choice, to whom all the promises of His blessing were given (comp. Gen. xii. 2, 3; xv. 5; xviii. 18; xx. 17, 18; xxvi. 3, 4; xxviii. 14, etc.).—Shall the women eat their fruit and children of a span long?—Should women eat their fruit, the children whom they nursed? This is a single indirect question, although it is contained in two members. אֵם, if [literally translated, the question is, *if—shall eat women their fruit, etc.*] is dependent on רָחֵם, see [see if

this is so, or should be so]. The sense of the question, moreover, is not, whether it had ever been heard of that mothers had been driven by hunger to eat their own offspring? (ROSENMUELLER), for then the perfect tense ought to have been used. But what is asked is, whether that thing, speaking in a general way, may be supposable, possible, or right; and to express this the imperfect must be used. The explanation of THENIUS, "Had they then been obliged to eat, etc., i. e., Had Thy judgments gone so far, that, etc.," is not sufficiently grammatical. What is asked is, whether this thing, generally speaking, would be allowed to happen? The answer to this question would involve another, whether it had been suffered to happen at that time? But the latter question is not directly contained in the words used.—The crime here mentioned is clearly designated as a punishment to the rebellious people; Deut. xxviii. 53; Jer. xix. 9. See 2 Kings vi. 28, 29; Lam. iv. 10.—**Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord**—*Should priest and prophet be slain, etc.* [ASSEM. ANN.: "Should God endure to see His own house polluted with the blood of His own priests and such as bore the name at least of His prophets."]

פְּרִי, *their fruit*. The masculine suffix has induced most interpreters unnecessarily to change the reading. [As the Sept. has καρπὸν κοιλίας αὐτῶν, and Chal. and Arab. similar readings, it has been conjectured that the original text was פְּרִי בֶטֶן, of which the ב changed into ם is all that remains in the present text. BLAYNEY suggests פְּרִי רַחֵם. OWEN has an original device of his own to meet this presumed difficulty. He says, "Fruit, in the sense of offspring, is applied to men as well as to women. We may take the final mem in םֶשֶׁךְ as a pronoun, *their wives*; the same are meant as in verse 18, *their voice* [heart?], i. e., the citizens of Jerusalem. Thus the construction will be quite grammatical. *Should their own wives eat their offspring.*" That would mean their wives ate, not their own, but their husbands' children. This would furnish preachers with a text against polygamy, or the cruelty of step-mothers! HENDERSON is satisfied with a magisterial appeal to euphony: "The masculine suffix is adopted instead of the feminine, to agree in form with םֶשֶׁךְ preceding."—W. H. H.] It is not even necessary, with CHR. B. MICHAELIS, to keep in mind mothers and fathers. The masculine, as the more comprehensive and higher sex, includes the feminine too. See my *Gr.*, § 60, 5; Jer. ix. 19; xlv. 19, 25; Gen. xxxi. 9; Ex. i. 21, etc.—**טָפְחוּ** occurs only here. It is the abstract of the verb **טָפַח**, which is found only in ver. 22 below. The latter (different from **טָפַח**, Is. xlviii. 13) is a denominative from **טָפַח**, *palma*, the hand-breadth, palm of the hand, and seemingly signifies *palms gestare* (the Latins say *ulnis gestare*). KIMCHI, VITRINGA, KALKAR would understand the expression of the smoothing of the limbs, as of the swaddling clothes and bands, with the palm of the hand. [With E. V., *children of a span long*, agree VULG.: *parvulos ad mēsuram palmæ*; LUTHER: die jüngsten Kindlein

einer Spanne lang; BROUGHTON: *infants that may be spanned*, and HENDERSON: *infants of a span long*. The idea of children carried in the hands is adopted by BLAYNEY: *children of palms*, i. e., "little ones dandled on the hands;" ROSENMUELLER: *infantes quos suis manibus tractant*; GERLACH: die Kinder, die man auf Händen trägt; and NOYES: *children borne in the arms*. The marginal reading in E. V., *children swaddled with their hands*, is thus explained in ASSEM. ANN.: "Because the verb means to *mete* or to *stretch out* aught with the hand, as Is. xlviii. 13. Hence both the Chaldee Paraphrast and the Rabbins here expound it *the children of swaddlings*; the children whose limbs the mothers were wont to stretch out and stroke, as if they were meting or measuring them with their hands, to fashion them and make them grow straight and proportionable; and to the same purpose also to make them up with swathing bands; for this word ariseth from a root frequent in the Talmudists, for a *wrapper* of linen, wherewith to wrap up aught; as also, for a *veil*, or *apron*, or the like, in Scripture, Ruth iii. 15; Is. iii. 22; and this interpretation receiveth further strength from what followeth here, ver. 22." CALVIN translates *parvulos educationis*, which OWEN translates, *infants while nursed*, the *children of nursings*, or *nurturings* (educationum). BOOTHROYD: *their little nurslings*. The Sept.: *those sucking the breasts*. After examining these various translations and interpretations, it is obvious that NAGELSACH has expressed the true meaning of the word, whatever is its fundamental primitive idea,—*the children whom they nursed*,—taking the last word in its most comprehensive sense.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 21. **The young and the old lie on the ground in the streets**—*Boy and old man lie on the ground in the streets*. [So GERLACH. BLAYNEY, NOYES: *The boy and the old man*. HENDERSON: *Boys and old men*.—The verb is preterite, and ought to be so translated. He is describing what was then past. *The boy and the old man lay on the ground*. BLAYNEY: *have lien*.—W. H. H.]—**My virgins and my young men**. See i. 4, 18; ii. 10; v. 11.—**Are—have—fallen by the sword**. See Jer. xix. 7; xx. 4; xxxix. 18. [BLAYNEY imagines the metre needs improving, and translates, *My virgins and my young men are fallen; with the sword hast thou slain them*, in utter disregard of the accents, besides the necessity of supplying a pronoun not expressed.—W. H. H.]—**Thou hast slain them in the day of thine anger; thou hast killed and not pitied**—*Thou hast killed in the day of thy anger* (see ver. 2); *hast slain and not pitied* (ver. 2). [The asyndetical construction, as in ver. 16, is vehement and forcible. *Thou hast killed, hast slain, hast not pitied*. To supply the conjunction and or personal pronoun *them* weakens the sentence.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 22. **Thou hast called—Thou callest together—as in a solemn day—as on a feast-day**. See ver. 6.—**My terrors round about** [lit. *from round about*, from every direction, so that they were surrounded by them. So BROUGHTON. CALVIN: "Here he uses a most appropriate metaphor, to show that the people had been brought to the narrowest straits; for he says that *terrors*

had on every side surrounded them, as when a solemn assembly is called. They sounded the trumpets when a festival was at hand, that all might come up to the Temple. As, then, many companies were wont to come to Jerusalem on feast-days—for when the trumpets were sounded all were called—so the Prophet says that terrors had been sent from every part to straiten the miserable people.” OWEN: “*My terrors mean my terrifiers, according to the Vulg., the abstract for the concrete.*”—W. H. H.]—**So that in the day of the LORD'S anger none escaped or remained.**—*And there was not on the day of Jehovah's wrath an escaped one or a survivor.* [The two words rendered *escaped* and *remained* seem to express the same idea; namely, to *escape*. As there were multitudes who *survived* the slaughter and still *remained* on earth, we cannot translate the second word by either of these terms, unless we regard them as merely hyperbolical. Probably the meaning is that none entirely escaped the effects of God's wrath, and we may translate thus, *there was not one that escaped or was exempt*. This is consistent with the meaning of the verb from which the noun is derived (שָׁרַד, *elabi*, to *escape*, to *get clear*, i. e., of condemnation or punishment), and is confirmed apparently by Jer. xlii. 17, “they shall die by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence: and none of them shall remain or escape,” i. e., *shall escape or be wholly exempt* (comp. Jer. xlv. 14),—“from the evil that I will bring upon them.” We may understand the phrase in our text as elliptical for the fuller expression as we find it in Jer. xlv. 14, *remain or escape from the evils*, שָׁרִיד וְפָלִיט מִכָּפֵי הָרָעָה. We may translate the sentence impersonally, *there was not that escaped or was exempt*. The wrath of the Lord descended on all things and all persons. The city and Zion, the walls and the gates, the sanctuary, palaces and houses, and all the inhabitants, without regard to age, sex or condition, were involved in a common ruin.—W. H. H.]—**Those that I have swaddled—Those I have carried or nursed, see ver. 20—and brought up, hath mine enemy consumed—my enemy destroyed them.** It is evident that the prayer is a prayer of lamentation, and with respect to its object responds to the exhortation contained in ver. 19 by giving the first place to the principal subject of that verse, without restricting itself to that subject, which is, besides, rather intimated than expressed.

כְּגִוִּים, *terrors*, every where else means *shelter*, place of accommodation, dwelling, commoratio, peregrinatio (Gen. xvii. 8; xxviii. 4; xxxvi. 7; xxxvii. 1; Ex. vi. 4, etc.), granary (Sing. כְּנוֹר, Ps. lv. 16). None of these meanings suits here. It is better therefore to derive it from כְּנוֹר, *terrifying*, which occurs frequently in Jeremiah, vi. 25; xx. 3, 4, 10; xli. 5; xli. 29. [GERLACH: “This word is certainly a designation of the enemy (Vulg.: *qui terrent me*), but is not to be restricted to them, see i. 20, since the formula so frequent in Jeremiah (vi. 25; xx. 4, 10; xli. 5; xli. 29) is a general expression for a position threatened on all sides with dangers and the terror prevailing therein.”—EWALD, according to GERLACH, takes the word in its more common signification

and insists that it relates to the same persons named in the second and last clauses of the verse. “The word denotes *my villagers round about*, and the inhabitants of the defenceless country towns and villages are intended, who were related to the chief protecting city as farmers, גִּרִּים (Sept. *παροικίας*). Thus the whole verse plainly alludes to a great event in the days of the siege. All the inhabitants of the country rushed into the principal city (as happened similarly under Titus) as if a great feast as of old were to be held in this city,—but alas! it would be in the end for them, at the final capture, the great festivity of murder.” This makes excellent sense of the whole verse, and is recommended by preserving the same subject throughout the three clauses of the verse,—which cannot be said of BLAYNEY'S translation, *Thou hast convoked, as on a set day, such as were strangers to me round about*, which gives us a new theme in each clause. But, as GERLACH remarks, the analogy of i. 15, the fact that the authority of the Sept. is weakened by its evident mistranslation of the formula in the prophetic book—*fear on every side*, and the difficulty of supposing that the flight of the country people to the city could be designated as a summons from the Lord, should confirm us in the usual translation of this passage.—W. H. H.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Ver. 1. “Olim erat regnum Israelitarum in sublimi, jam sub timo.” FÖRSTER.

2. Ver. 1. “When Jeremiah says throughout, the Lord has done it, disregarding what Babel did, he would teach us, when injury is inflicted upon us by the world and men, that we should regard, not the instruments, who could not injure the least hair of our heads, but God, who does and ordains it (Lam. iii. 37; Am. iii. 6; Is. xlv. 7; Sir. xi. 14), that He (1) is impelled to it by our sins, and (2) that He prepares His punishments in Heaven, before they are inflicted on transgressors. This serves to make us patient. Example: Job says not, The Devil, the Chaldeans, the Arabians, did this, but God has done it.” CRAMER, according to EG. HUNNIUS, Ser. I., ch. 2, p. 45.—[Ver. 1, etc. **How hath Jehovah, etc.** “The grief is not so much that such and such things are done, as that God has done them; this, this is their wormwood and gall.” “To those who know how to value God's favor, nothing appears more dreadful than His anger; corrections in love are easily borne, but rebukes in wrath wound deep.” MATT. HENRY.]

3. Ver. 1. “Bellarmine is not wise in attempting to establish the worship of images from this text, and especially from Ps. xcix. 5 (*Lib. II., de cultu imaginum*, cap. 12). For the Psalmist would not have the pious worship the temple of the Lord, or the ark of the covenant, or mercy-seat. . . . Therefore, in Hebrew it is not said, *Worship His footstool*, but *Worship at [or toward] His footstool*. AUGUSTINE understands this as said with reference to the human nature of Christ, in which the Logos is adorned with Divine worship (λατρεία). But this interpretation rather strengthens than weakens the argument of the Jesuit.” FÖRSTER.

4. Ver. 1. “If men themselves are not worthy,

He rejects all their ceremonies. He inquires nothing about stone houses with their splendor, nothing about the external form of the church, but He will prepare for Himself the souls of individuals in the fire for all eternity." DIEDRICH.

5. Ver. 2. "The Abbot RUPERT, in his commentary on the books of Kings (B. V., ch. 14) understands the fall of Jezebel out of the window (2 Kings ix. 33),—as well as the passage before us, which is expressed in the Vulgate thus, "the Lord hath cast down headlong . . . all that was beautiful in Jacob,"—as a prophecy of the vengeance which Israel has incurred, for the shedding of the blood of Christ; and he then says, 'That fall has been heard of throughout the whole world. Lo! that synagogue which slew Christ, where is it? Truly, whatever seems to remain may be compared to what the dogs left of Jezebel's body.'" GHISLER., p. 70.

6. Ver. 2. "PASCHASIUS RABBERTUS observes on this passage, that kingdom, king, priest, Temple, stronghold, etc., may be nothing else than 'as it were, some great prophet or prophecy' contained in earthen vessels. 'But now that Christ has come, since the various predictions concerning Him, which were contained in those vessels, have been fulfilled, they have all been cast down and broken, destroyed and scattered, polluted and profaned, that all the mystical and unutterable secrets which were concealed in them should be made apparent to the whole world, being revealed more clearly than light.'" GHISLER.

7. Ver. 2. **He hath polluted, etc.** "This is, truly, the result of the profanation of the Divine name and majesty, which was at times extremely common even among the chief men; and this result is in accordance with the rule of divine justice in Wisdom xi. 17—Wherewithal a man sinneth, by the same also shall he be punished." FÖRSTER. "The secret of their strength was taken away from the people in the persons of their princes, as Samson lost his strength when he had violated his vow." DIEDRICH.—[Ver. 2. PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that as Thou settest before us at this day those ancient examples by which we perceive with what heavy punishments Thou didst chastise those whom Thou hadst adopted,—O grant, that we may learn to regard Thee, and carefully to examine our whole life, and duly consider how indulgently Thou hast preserved us to this day, so that we may ever patiently bear Thy chastisements, and with a humble and sincere heart flee to Thy mercy, until Thou be pleased to raise up Thy Church from that miserable state in which it now lies, and so to restore it, that Thy name may, through Thine only-begotten Son, be glorified throughout the whole world. Amen." CALVIN.]

8. Ver. 3. "This consideration can and ought to check pride and arrogance, and prevent us from fiercely erecting our horns, being mindful of that notorious saying:

Cornua quæ faciunt, ne cornua ferre recusent.

And from Zech. i. 18-21 we learn, that the Lord can easily raise up smiths to break the horns of those who are fierce and insolent." FÖRSTER.

9. Ver. 5. "God has made Christ a horn of

salvation to His church, that it should receive from His fulness grace, blessing, strength and power. Whoever will not make use of Christ for this purpose, His carnal ability will soon go to wreck and ruin. Luke i. 69." STARKE.

10. Ver. 5. "When Judea denied the mystery of our Lord's incarnation, which the Gentiles believed, the princes of Judea fell into contempt, and these Gentiles, who had been oppressed while guilty of unbelief, were elevated into the liberty of the true faith. But Jeremiah, foreseeing long before it happened this fall of the Israelites, says, The Lord has become as if He were an enemy. He has overthrown Israel, He has overthrown all his walls. He has overthrown His defences." GREG. PAPA, Lib. XI., Moral. Cap. 10, quoted by GHISLER., p. 76.

11. Ver. 5. **וְהָיָה כְּחִיָּה**. "The VULGATE version has, *humiliatam et humiliationem* [one humbled and humiliation]. AVENARIUS interprets *invecum et invectionem* [attack and assault by sea] and explains it as relating to naval conflicts and the various methods of assaulting an enemy: since both words are from *anah*, which properly signifies to be carried in ships." FÖRSTER. [NOTE.—FÖRSTER either misquoted the Vulgate, or intended only to give the sense, in his understanding of it. The Vulgate is *humiliatam et humiliatam*; which the Douay translates "and hath multiplied in the daughter of Judea the afflicted, both men and women." The VULG. is a translation of the SEPT.: καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν τῇ θυγατρὶ Ἰούδα ταπεινοῦμενον καὶ τεταπεινωμένον.—W. H. H.]

12. Vers. 4, 5. "Here a distinction between the evil of *crime* and the evil of *punishment* is to be observed. God is not the efficient cause of the evil of crime. The opinion of PETER MARTYR, in his Commentary on the first chapter of Romans, is, therefore, impious and horrible,—'I cannot deny that God is in every way the cause of sin.' God is, however, the chief cause of the evil of punishment, being a just Judge and the avenger of crimes. In this sense the inimical acts of the Babylonians are here attributed directly to Him." FÖRSTER.

13. Vers. 6, 7. "The Lord, who never suffers Himself to be forgotten 'causes our solemn feasts and the Sabbaths of our rest to be forgotten,' not because the rites of our religion do not please Him, but because the former tabernacle of God or the temple of the Holy Ghost in us is profaned, and there is now no place in which those rites may be so offered as to please God." PASCHAS. RABBERTUS by GHISLER., p. 79.

14. Vers. 6, 7. "The Romanists, therefore, err when they pretend that Rome is the fixed and immovable seat of the church. For although the Catholic and universal church cannot cease to exist (Matt. xvi. 18), yet that particular churches have perished and can perish, experience testifies, yea Rome herself testifies by an example in her own history. . . . What is here related of the temple at Jerusalem, that it should assuredly be demolished and overthrown, has happened to temples of Christ at the hands of the Turks. It is a fact also especially memorable, that on the 29th day of May, in the year 1453, the Turks having assembled and taken Constantinople, the temple of Sophia, esteemed so sacred, was turned into a horse-stable. And this is

what was long ago written in Ps. lxxviii. 59-64, and also Ps. lxxx. 13, 14." FÖRSTER.—[Ver. 7. "Had he only spoken of the city, of the lands, of the palaces, of the vineyards, and, in short, of all their possessions, it would have been a much lighter matter; but when he says that God had counted as nothing all their sacred things,—the altar, the Temple, the ark of the covenant, and festive days,—when, therefore, he says, that God had not only disregarded, but had also cast away from Him these things, which yet especially availed to conciliate His favor, the people must have hence perceived, except they were beyond measure stupid, how grievously they had provoked God's wrath against themselves; for this was the same as though heaven and earth were blended together. Had there been an upsetting of all things, had the sun left its place and sunk into darkness, had the earth heaved upwards, the confusion would have hardly been more dreadful, than when God put forth thus His hand against the sanctuary, the altar, the festal days, and all their sacred things. But we must refer to the reason why this was done, even because the Temple had been long polluted by the iniquities of the people, and because all sacred things had been wickedly and disgracefully profaned. We now, then, understand why the Prophet enlarged so much on a subject in itself sufficiently plain." CALVIN.]

15. Ver. 7. "Wherewith one sins, therewith is he punished (Wis. xi. 17). But because the most heinous sins had been perpetrated at the altar and Divine worship, so now at the altar the severe chastisement is inflicted, that they must be deprived of it." CRAMER.—[Ver. 7. **They have made a noise in the house of Jehovah**—"Why did He grant so much license to these profane enemies? even because the Jews themselves had previously polluted the Temple, so that He abhorred all their solemn assemblies, as also He declares by Isaiah, that He detested their festivals, Sabbaths and new moons (i. 13, 14). But it was a shocking change, when enemies entered the place which God had consecrated for Himself, and there insolently boasted, and uttered base and wicked calumnies against God! But the sadder the spectacle, the more detestable appeared the impiety of the people, which had been the cause of so great evils. * * * That the Chaldeans polluted the Temple, that they trod under foot all sacred things, all this the Prophet shows was to be ascribed to the Jews themselves, who had, through their own conduct, opened the Temple to the Chaldeans and exposed all sacred things to their will and pleasure." CALVIN.]

16. Ver. 9. "God is careful to punish contempt of His word by taking away that word. The curse which they chose, that is come to them; the blessing they did not choose, that is far from them, Ps. cix. 17." CRAMER.

17. Vers. 1-10. "Although God, properly speaking, allows Himself to repent of nothing, and His gifts and callings admit of no change (Rom. xi. 20), yet it is evident from this passage, that He is bound to no particular people, especially if that people prove to be godless and unthankful towards Him. He had chosen the people of Israel for His own peculiar people, Jerusa-

lem for His dwelling, where He had, as it were His fire and His hearth (Is. xxxi. 9), and had lifted it up to Heaven; but when it became ungrateful and disobedient, He considered not all this, but cast down to the earth all the glory of Israel, laid waste His own tabernacle, destroyed His dwelling, overthrew His altar. For God is not only merciful and kind, but also an angry and just Judge, who will not let iniquity go unpunished, and makes His chastisements the more severe in proportion to the kindness He has shown to a people, when they are ungrateful and godless. This should be a solemn warning to us." *Würtemb. Summ.* ["Even those doctrines, ordinances and regulations, which are most exactly scriptural, when scrupulously retained by men destitute of the Spirit of God, are but a lifeless carcass of religion: and when made a cloak for iniquity, God abhors them. So that, in the day of His wrath for national wickedness, He will despise temples and palaces, kings and priests, establishments and forms of every kind." SCOTT.]

18. Ver. 10. **They have cast up dust upon their heads, etc.** *Luctus pro luxu*, FÖRSTER.

19. Ver. 11. "Effusion of the liver is carnal mortification." BONAVENTURA, quoted by GHISLER., p. 91.

20. Ver. 13. "When God punishes His people on account of their sins, He punishes them more severely than He does other peoples. It may be said of Him, The dearer the child, the harder the rod." OSIANDRI BIBLE IN STARKE. ["When we wish to alleviate grief, we are wont to bring examples which have some likeness to the case before us. For when any one seeks to comfort one in illness, he will say, 'Thou art not the first nor the last, thou hast many like thee; why shouldst thou so much torment thyself; for this is a condition almost common to mortals.' * * The Prophet, then, means that comforts commonly administered to those in misery, would be of no benefit, because the calamity of Jerusalem exceeded all other examples; as though he had said, 'No such thing has ever happened in the world; God had never before thundered so tremendously against any people.' * * *Great as the sea is thy breach*; that is, 'Thy calamity is the deepest abyss. I cannot then find any in the whole world whom I can compare to thee, for thy calamity exceeds all calamities; nor is there anything like it that can be set before thee, so that thou art become a memorable example for all ages.' But when we hear the Prophet speaking thus, we ought to remember that we have succeeded in the place of the ancient people. As then, God had formerly punished with so much severity the sins of His chosen people, we ought to beware lest we in the present day provoke Him to an extremity by our perverseness, for He remains ever like Himself." CALVIN.]

21. Ver. 14. "Preachers, so soothing, are smooth-preachers and dumb dogs, who bring great and irreparable injury to a whole country, for the sun shall go down over such prophets and the day shall be dark over them (Mic. iii. 6). And although they may receive for a long time good-will and favor, money and encouragement from men, yet they lose, together with their hearers who delight in such accommodating ministers, all that they have in the living God; Gal. i.

10; James iv. 4." CRAMER according to EG. HUNNIUS, *Ser.* 3, ch. 2, p. 64. ["They had wilfully drunk sweet poison." CALVIN.—PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that though Thou chastisest us as we deserve, we may yet never have the light of truth extinguished among us, but may ever see, even in darkness, at least some sparks, which may enable us to behold Thy paternal goodness and mercy, so that we may be especially humbled under Thy mighty hand, and that being really prostrate through a deep feeling of repentance, we may raise our hopes to Heaven, and never doubt that Thou wilt at length be reconciled to us when we seek Thee in Thine only-begotten Son. Amen." CALVIN.]

22. Vers. 15, 16. "He who suffers an injury, need not mind mockery. It is the Devil's special delight to make a mock of the church and of all the pious, so that the godless are known by their great Ahs and Ohs (Wis. v. 3)! Let not, however, ridicule cause us to waver, but let us remain firm and faithful to God. For blessed are ye when men, for My sake, revile and persecute you and say all manner of evil against you (Matt. v. 11). For God can easily and speedily take away again such reproach and put to silence the triumphing of the wicked, and apply to them the song—Mine eyes will see that they shall be trodden down as the mire of the streets (Mic. vii. 10)." CRAMER quoted by EG. HUNNIUS, *Ser.* 4, ch. 2, p. 73).

23. Vers. 14–16. "This is, in truth, the root of the calamity, that the prophets in the service of the people had preached in accordance with carnal pleasures; they had not disclosed but concealed the misdeeds of the people, and thus had preached the people out of their country, and into captivity. How then was this? Had they invented new precepts? made another catechism? No, nothing at all of this sort! But it sufficed for the purpose of destruction, that they mistook the Gospel, and exercised no control over the people in conformity therewith, but instead of that practised a false policy. Now the enemies of Jerusalem and of God's people mock and imagine that all the glorious promises of the Word of God of a kingdom of grace among men have come to naught. They imagine that they have now made it evident by their power, that the mystery of God's grace and election is naught. Poor fools! They know not that God is in all this; they know nothing of that God, who suffers with us and for us, and leads us through suffering to glory." DIEDRICH.

24. Ver. 17. "When we experience God's judgment and chastisements on account of our sins, we ought always to look back (1) on ourselves, (2) on God's frequent warnings of punishment, (3) on His unchangeable faithfulness, and (4) on His great power and His right hand which can change all things, Ps. lxxvii. 11; Dan. ix. 8; Ps. li. 5." CRAMER, quoted by EG. HUNNIUS, *Ser.* 4, Ch. II., pp. 74 ff.—[Ver. 17. **He hath fulfilled His word that He had commanded in the days of old.**—"Had the Prophet touched only on the secret counsel of God, the Jews might have been in doubt as to what it was. And certainly as our minds cannot penetrate into that deep abyss, in vain would he have spoken of the hidden judgments of God. It was, therefore,

necessary to come down to the doctrine, by which God, as far as it is expedient, manifests to us what would otherwise be not only hidden, but also incomprehensible; for were we to inquire into God's judgments, we would sink into the deep. But when we direct our minds to what God has taught us, we find that He reveals to us whatever is necessary to be known; and though even by His word, we cannot perfectly know His hidden judgments, yet we may know them in part, and as I have said, as far as it is expedient for us. . . . Let us then hold to this rule, even to seek from the Law and the Prophets, and the Gospel, whatever we desire to know concerning the secret judgments of God; for were we to turn aside, even in the smallest degree, from what is taught us, the immensity of God's glory would immediately swallow up all our thoughts; and experience sufficiently teaches us, that nothing is more dangerous and even fatal than to allow ourselves more liberty in this respect than what behooves us. Let us then learn to bridle all curiosity when we speak of God's secret judgments, and instantly to direct our minds to the word itself, that they may be in a manner inclosed therein." CALVIN.]

25. Ver. 18. "In this exhortation, the requisites of true and ardent prayer are shown. (1) The first of these is the *cry of the heart* to God, by which devoutness, or the earnest and ardent desire of the heart is denoted. For, as CYPRIAN says, in his 12th *Sermon* on the Lord's Prayer, God hears not the voice, but the heart. And it is commonly said, When the heart does not pray, then the tongue labors in vain. (2) *Tears, i. e.*, by metonymy, true penitence, of which tears are signs, as appears in the case of the sinful woman (Luke vii. 38), and of Peter (Luke xxii. 62). And well-known is that saying of the orthodox Father, The tears of sinners are angels' bread and angels' wine." FÖRSTER.

26. Vers. 18–22. "Here we have a lesson,—when, to whom, and how, we ought to pray. We should pray always and not faint, as Christ teaches us by a parable (Luke xviii.), but especially when there is a great and immediate necessity, as Jeremiah did here, and David, The anguish of my heart is great, O bring me, Lord, out of my distresses (Ps. xxv. 17). To this Lord the prophet Jeremiah here points the people. God Himself calls us to come to Him only, and says, Call upon Me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee and thou shalt glorify Me (Ps. l. 15). Not alone should you mouth pray, but, says Jeremiah, let your heart cry to God. For the Lord is near to those who call upon Him, to those who call upon Him with earnestness (Ps. cxlv. 18). We should present before Him circumstantially our necessity and solicitudes, with tears and sighs, as Jeremiah here directs. For although God well knows beforehand what distresses us and what we need, before we tell Him (Matt. vi. 8), yet the recital of our pressing necessity serves to make us more earnest in prayer; for God will have those who pray, such as those who worship Him in spirit and in truth (John iv. 23)." WÄRT. *Summarien*.

27. Ver. 19. **Arise, cry out in the night.**—"The prayer of night—how readily it rises to God the only Judge, and to the Holy Angel who undertakes to present it before the Heavenly al-

tar! How grateful and bright, colored with the blush of humility! How serene and placid, disturbed by no clamor or bustle! And last of all, how pure and sincere, sprinkled with no dust of earthly care, incited by no praise or flattery of beholders!" BERNARD, *Serm.* 86 on the Canticles, in GHISLER, p. 108.

28. Ver. 20. **Behold, O Jehovah, and consider.**—"It is most proper, when any one is overwhelmed with affliction, that he keep it not entirely to himself, but disclose it to such persons as may come to his relief in the way either of help or of comfort. But to no one can we better and more advantageously lament our distresses and solitudes, than to our dear God, for He is our confidence, a strong tower from our enemies (Ps. lxi. 4)." CRAMER quoted by EG. HUNNIUS, *Ser.* 4, ch. 2, p. 78.—[PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that as Thy Church at this day is oppressed with many evils, we may learn to raise up not only our eyes and our hands to Thee, but also our hearts, and that we may so fix our attention on Thee as to look for salvation from Thee alone; and that though despair may overwhelm us on earth, yet the hope of Thy goodness may ever shine on us from Heaven, and that, relying on the Mediator whom Thou hast given us, we may not hesitate to cry continually to Thee, until we really find by experience that our prayers have not been in vain, when Thou, pitying Thy church, hast extended Thy hand, and given us cause to rejoice, and hast turned our mourning into joy, through Christ our Lord. Amen." CALVIN.]

29. Ver. 21. **The young and the old.**—"When general judgments proceed from God, the old and the young must suffer together: the old, because they have not rightly educated the young: the young, because they have imitated the wickedness of the old." CRAMER.

30. [Vers. 19-22. "Comforts for the cure of these lamentations are here sought for and prescribed. The two most common topics, that their case is neither *singular* nor *desperate*, are here tried, but laid by, because they would not hold. No wisdom or power of man can repair the desolations of such a broken, shattered state. It is to no purpose, therefore, to administer these common cordials; therefore, the method of cure prescribed is, to refer her to God, that by penitent prayer she may commit her case to Him, and be instant and constant in her supplications, ver. 19. 'Arise out of thy despondency, cry out in the night, watch unto prayer; be importunate with God for mercy, be free and full, be sincere and serious; open thy mind, spread thy case before the Lord; lift up thine hands towards Him in holy desire and expectations; beg for the life of thy young children.' Take with you words, take with you these words, ver. 20. Prayer is a remedy for every malady, even the most grievous. And our business in prayer is not to prescribe, but to

subscribe to the wisdom and will of God; *Lord, behold and consider, and Thy will be done.*" HENRY.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. Vers. 1-10. As a warning against a proud confidence of security, our text can be used for a sermon on this theme.—*The judgment on the members of the old covenant is a solemn warning for the members of the new covenant.* I. *The judgment.* 1. Who judges? The Lord. 2. How does He judge? With rigorous righteousness. 3. Why does He judge? Because His wrath has been provoked by sins. II. *The warning.* 1. They were the natural branches; we engrafted ones (Rom. xi. 24). They had for their part only the revelation of the law; we the revelation of grace. 2. From this it follows that we have to expect a similar judgment, not only with the same, but assuredly with greater certainty.

2. Ver. 9. *The blessing of a well ordered political and ecclesiastical condition of affairs.* I. What belongs to such order? 1. That the civil magistracy administer the law. 2. That the teachers of God's word rightly divide it. II. What are the salutary fruits thereof? 1. In a temporal point of view, Order, Right and Righteousness, peace and general prosperity. 2. In a spiritual point of view, Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good will from God to men.

3. Vers. 11, 12. These verses could be preached upon in a time of severe famine. I. Describe the actual condition of things. The distress: 1, of the children; 2, of the parents. II. Exhort to lively sympathy and the actual manifestation of pity.

4. Vers. 13, 14. *The hurt of the daughter of Zion.* 1. Wherein it consists. 2. Its causes. 3. Its cure.

5. Vers. 13, 14. *The immense responsibility of the office of the preacher.* 1. To whom are the preachers responsible (and whose word have they therefore to publish)? 2. What blessings may they be the authors of by a constant consideration of this responsibility? 3. What injury may they do by not considering the same?

6. Vers. 15, 16. *Warning against malicious joy in the misfortunes of others.* We understand this in a double sense; whilst we (1), warn against such conduct as may make one a subject of the malicious joy of others; (2), we warn against malicious exultation over the misfortunes of others.

7. Vers. 16, 17. *The impressive sermon which is contained in great calamities.* 1. These warn us; 1, against the pride which goes before a fall; 2, against malicious joy over the fall of our neighbor. II. They instruct us, 1, to consider the warnings of the Lord; 2, to recognize plainly His hand in the blows which befall men.

8. Vers. 18-22. *The prayer of the distressed.* 1. It comes out of the heart. 2. It is the expression of deep pain. 3. It is not satisfied with few words. 4. It is directed confidently to the Lord.

CHAPTER III.

THE MIDDLE SONG CONSTITUTING THE CLIMAX OF THE POEM: ISRAEL'S BRIGHTER DAY OF CONSOLATION CONTRASTED WITH THE GLOOMY NIGHT OF SORROW EXPERIENCED BY THE SERVANT OF GOD [AS REPRESENTED BY JEREMIAH HIMSELF].

This Song, which as the third one of the five holds the middle place, is the culmination point of the whole book, and thus affords a strong argument for the opinion, that the whole book is constructed on one carefully considered plan. It is the culmination point, both as to its matter and as to its form. As to its matter, because we have here the sublimest conceptions of suffering. As to its form, because here the art of the Poet displays itself in full splendor. This appears, first of all, in the alphabetical arrangement. Whilst the other songs have only twenty-two alphabetically arranged verses, this one contains sixty-six verses, arranged in triplets, the three verses of each triplet beginning with the same letter. Each verse is a distich, composed of a rising and falling inflection. The ternary division is observable not merely in reference to the verses beginning with the same initial letter, but with regard to the arrangement of the whole: for the whole Song is naturally divided into three parts. The first part embraces vers. 1-18: the second, vers. 19-42: the third, vers. 43-66.

PART I.

III. 1-18.

- ⌘ Ver. 1. I am the man who saw affliction
 By the rod of His wrath.
 ⌘ Ver. 2. He led me and brought me
 Into darkness and not light.
 ⌘ Ver. 3. Surely against me He turned His hand
 Again and again the whole day long.
 ⌘ Ver. 4. He caused my flesh and my skin to waste away,
 He broke my bones.
 ⌘ Ver. 5. He built around and encompassed me
 With bitterness and distress.
 ⌘ Ver. 6. He caused me to dwell in dark places,
 As the dead of old.
 ⌘ Ver. 7. He hedged me in that I should not go forth,
 He made my chain heavy.
 ⌘ Ver. 8. Also, lest I should cry and call for help,
 He shut out my prayer.
 ⌘ Ver. 9. He hedged in my ways with hewn stone,
 He made my paths crooked.
 ⌘ Ver. 10. A lurking bear was He to me—
 A lion in ambush.
 ⌘ Ver. 11. He drove me aside—He tore me in pieces—
 He left me suffering and alone.
 ⌘ Ver. 12. He bent His bow, and set me
 As the mark for the arrow.
 ⌘ Ver. 13. He shot into my reins
 The sons of His quiver.
 ⌘ Ver. 14. I became a laughing-stock to all my people,
 Their song all the day.
 ⌘ Ver. 15. He filled me with bitter things.
 He made me drunk with wormwood.
 ⌘ Ver. 16. He broke my teeth with pebbles,
 He covered me with ashes.
 ⌘ Ver. 17. Thou didst thrust me away from peace:
 I forgot good.
 ⌘ Ver. 18. Then I said, My confidence and my hope
 Are perished from Jehovah!

ANALYSIS.

After the first triad of verses, containing the theme, the Poet, or rather the person whom the Poet represents as speaking (and who will be understood as always intended, where the sense allows it, when for the sake of brevity we say "the Poet,") describes what he had suffered physically, vers. 4, 5; and in regard to light and freedom, vers. 6, 7; how the Lord had rejected his prayer, ver. 8; shut up his

way, ver. 9; attacked and worried him like a bear or lion, vers. 10, 11; made him a mark for his arrows, like an archer, piercing into his very soul, vers. 12, 13; how he had thus become an object of scorn to the people, ver. 14; and drunk with bitterness, ver. 15; and how, as it were, they had given him pebbles to bite and covered him with ashes, ver. 16. In vers. 17, 18, he expresses the sense of these images in literal language; God has deprived him of peace and happiness, till he was well nigh compelled to throw away his confidence in God. Thus ends this first part, in which the name of the Lord is not mentioned except as the last word of ver. 18, where it appears with peculiar emphasis and, as it were, with a grating dissonance. It is to be observed, however, that in the whole of this first part, only those sorrows which God had sent upon His servant are spoken of; or rather, all sorrows which befall him are made to appear as Divine temptations. Hence the suppression of Jehovah's name till the very close; where at length it is announced, that it may be more dreadfully apparent whom it was that the Poet was on the point of renouncing.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

The following general remarks on this section are to be observed. 1. It contains a description of the personal sorrows of one prominent man. This man was distinguished by his position as well as by his sufferings. The former is evident from ver. 14, where it is said he had become a derision to all the people; this could only happen to one who stood out conspicuously before the eyes of all the people. The second appears from the fact, that he is described as one burdened with sorrows more than all other persons (vers. 1-3). 2. We must recognize in the man thus made conspicuous the prophet Jeremiah. For not only the description beginning at ver. 52, undoubtedly refers to what befell this prophet as related in Jer. xxxviii., but also, before that passage occurs, ver. 14 plainly indicates this prophet (see the exposition). There is then no doubt that this Song is put into the mouth of the prophet Jeremiah. 3. As in chapter second, in the first nine verses, the

destruction of Jerusalem is described as the act of God, so in this chapter the Poet ascribes all his sorrows to God as their author. He represents them as *divine temptations*. There is only this difference, that whilst in chap. ii., the name of God is frequently mentioned (יְהוָה, אֱלֹהִים, vers. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8), in chap. iii. God is spoken of in vers. 1-16, only indefinitely in the third person, in ver. 17 He is first addressed in the second person, and in ver. 18 He is at last distinctly mentioned by name (יְהוָה). This is evidently a designed climax. I do not think with ENGELHARDT (p. 85), that a tender conscience prevented the Poet from indicating the Lord, explicitly by name, as the author of his profound mental agitation; for what he did in chapter second, and repeats in ver. 18 of this chapter, he could have done in vers. 1-16. But this making the name of God prominent in the last verse, at the culmination point of the description of his sufferings, is due to the *art* of the Poet, of which this Song affords striking evidence.

III. 1-3.

1, 2 I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of His wrath. He hath led
3 me and brought me into darkness, but not into light. Surely against me is he turned;
he turneth his hand against me all the day.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 1.—נָכַר not infrequent in Jer., xvii. 5, 7; xxii. 30; xxiii. 9, etc. In Lamentations in this chapter only, and here four times, vers. 1, 27, 35, 39.—Jeremiah never uses אָנִי, see i. 13. The choice of the word here seems due to similarity of sound with אָנִי, comp. Ps. lxxxviii. 16.—שָׁבַת in Jeremiah only in the two critically suspected places, x. 16; xv. 19, where שָׁבַת נַחֲלָתוֹ is found. This exact phrase שָׁבַת עֲבָרָתוֹ is found (as has not been before remarked, that I know of) in Prov. xxii. 8, in that part of the Proverbs, too, which is acknowledged to be the oldest and which extends from x. 1 to xxii. 16. The expression *there* is used in the sense of being blamed by men; here, the suffix refers to it God.—עָנְיָה, see ii. 2.

Ver. 2.—רָגַע not in Jeremiah in any form.—Hiph. הוֹלִיךְ Jeremiah often uses, ii. 16, 17; xxxi. 9; xxxii. 5.—The substantive חֶשֶׁן never in Jeremiah. He seldom expresses this general thought, and when he does, he uses other words; נֶשֶׁן, צָלְמוֹת, עֵפֶל, xiii. 16, 17; ii. 6, אֶפְלָה; xxiii. 12, כְּאֶפְלָה; ii. 31. [If he preferred here a word he never used before, euphony alone would suggest it to him. It happens, however, that of the five words in his prophecies above cited, *four* of them he uses only *once*, and the fifth, צָלְמוֹת, only *twice*; and one of the five, כְּאֶפְלָה, is not found elsewhere in the Bible. Where such variety of terms are used to express the same idea, the introduction of another new one may be deemed as characteristic of the author. At least this word חֶשֶׁן, affords no evidence against Jeremiah's authorship of Lamentations.—W. H. H.]—לֹא, see ii. 1, 2, 14, 17; iii. 7, 49; iv. 6.—With respect to the Acc. loci, see ii. 21.

Ver. 3.—יִשָּׁב יְהִפֵּךְ. In regard to the peculiar idiom by which an adverbial idea is expressed by a finite verb, see my *Gr.*, § 95, *g. n.* [Also GREEN'S *Gr.*, § 269]. In Jer. xviii. 4, שָׁב occurs in a similar construction [see marginal reading in E. V.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. I am the man.—[The references to the personal experiences of the prophet Jeremiah

in this chapter are too evident to be disputed. That these words were the words of Jeremiah himself must be the opinion of all who read this chapter unprejudiced by a theory to the contrary (see Introduction). But we are not to regard

him as speaking here as a private person. He speaks as the Prophet of Jehovah raised up at that particular juncture, to stand between the people and their covenant God, to reveal His will to them and to present their interest to God at the throne of grace, for these were the twofold functions of the prophet's office. The Prophet therefore was a representative man. He stood for the people. He suffered for the people. He spoke for the people. Hence in this Song Jeremiah easily passes from the singular to the plural forms of speech, from *I* and *me*, to *we* and *us*. [GERLACH: "The supposition that in this chapter the personal sufferings of the Prophet are the subject of his Lamentation (MICHAELIS, PAREAU, MAURER, KALKAR, BLEEK in his Introduction), cannot be certainly proved, either from ver. 14 (see *Comm.* on that ver.), nor from the description contained in 53-55, where the *possibility* of a figurative sense cannot be denied. In opposition to this opinion are the following arguments. 1. From the fact that *we* imperceptibly takes the place of *I* in ver. 22 and vers. 40-47, we may conclude that in the rest of the chapter also, the prophet does not speak only in his own name and of his own person. 2. Unless we would destroy the whole connection of the chapter, we must allow that the calamity, recognized in vers. 42, 43, as the punishment of the sins of the people (*we* have sinned), is the same calamity which is described in vers. 1-18 with reference to the experience of a single individual—an opinion, which, by manifold agreements between the two sections, is shown to be correct. 3. The lamentation of the Prophet over his own past suffering, in the actual presence of a great national calamity, would be no less improbable, than the position of this chapter, in the middle of four others lamenting the national calamity, would in that case be inappropriate. The Lamentation of this chapter is then correctly understood only, when it is regarded as a lamentation of every one of the individual pious Israelites, as a lamentation which, while proceeding from self-experienced mental sufferings, has its truth, nevertheless, for all pious Israelites, in whose name the Prophet speaks. This was perceived by ABEN EZRA, when he designated the individual Israelites as the subject lamenting, and in this most modern interpreters (ROSENUELLER, EWALD, THENIUS, NEUMANN, VAHINGER) agree."—W. H. H.]—**That hath seen affliction**—*who saw misery, i. e., experienced it.* RASCHI is of the opinion that the verb here expresses the idea of *living to see* the fulfilment of the destruction predicted, which would suit Jeremiah alone. But in that case it would at least have been necessary to say (רָאָה) *the affliction*, or *misery*. The verb may have the sense, in a general way, of *experiencing or living to see*, as frequently (see Jer. v. 12; Ps. xvi. 10; xlix. 10; Eccl. viii. 16; ix. 9). But the distinction between prophecy and fulfilment is too feebly indicated, to admit of RASCHI's interpretation. The Poet has rather in view the distinction between higher and comparatively inferior degrees of suffering. He would simply say that he had suffered more than all other persons. Besides, *man* (אָדָם) would be too indefinite.

We would expect *seer* (רֹאֶה), or *prophet* (נָבִי); [I am the prophet, or seer, who has lived to see the fulfilment of my own predictions.]—**By the rod of his wrath.**—The expression can only mean, that the Poet had seen misery in consequence of God's using the rod of His wrath. Compare Is. x. 5, where the Lord calls the Assyrian *the rod of My anger*, and Job ix. 34; xxi. 9, where the rod of God is spoken of in a general way. [CALVIN: "At the very beginning he acknowledges that whatever he suffered had been inflicted by God's hand . . . there is included in the word *wrath* a brief confession, especially when it is added by the *rod*, or *staff*."]—

Ver. 2. **He hath led me and brought me—He led and brought me—into darkness but (or, and) not into light.**—The metaphor, [of light and darkness for prosperity and adversity] is found in Am. v. 18, 20; Job xii. 25, expressed in the same Hebrew phrase.

Ver. 3. **Surely against me.**—The threefold prominence given to the person speaking, by the repetition of the personal pronoun three times in the beginning of the Song, is not without a reason. These introductory verses thus acquire a *thematic* character, *i. e.*, it is thus indicated that the speaker intends to make his own person especially a *theme* of discourse. His justification in this is, that he can with good reason assume to himself the personality punished to the greatest degree by sufferings of every sort. While he was this, he was also at the same time a leader, as it were, of all punished in the same way, therefore the representative of a whole class of sufferers, —of the Israel, hated by men but beloved of God, of the *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα*—the spiritual Israel. This explanation would not stand, if we were to understand the *whole* people as indicated by *the man* in ver. 1. That the *whole* people are not so designated by *the man*, will be seen further on. For the present, the expression itself, *the man*, furnishes an argument against it: for throughout the book Zion is always spoken of as a female. See *his strongholds*, ii. 5, where only the masculine pronoun is used in reference to Zion, and there only because the words are a quotation. [Probably the pronoun there refers to God, not to Zion. See the Notes.—W. H. H.]—**Is he turned; he turneth his hand against me all the day.**—*turned he his hand always against the whole day.* [*He turns His hand again and again the whole day long.* The Hebrew is very idiomatic. The true construction is explained by the grammatical note of NAEGLSACH above, referring to the use of a verb in an adverbial sense. The best grammarians and Versions agree in this construction. Our English Version is obviously wrong, not only because it translates both verbs transitively, but because it translates them in different tenses and is obliged to supply the words *against me* in the last clause. The verbs are both future and ought to be taken in the sense of the historical imperfect, because the Prophet would express the constant repetition of God's strokes, or else as a present tense, because the prophet is referring to sufferings not yet at an end.—W. H. H.] **All the day.**—See i. 13; iii. 14, 62. [He smote me and continues smiting me again and again, all the day long.—W. H. H.]

III. 4-9.

4, 5 My flesh and my skin hath he made old: he hath broken my bones. He hath builded against me, and compassed me with gall and travail. He hath set me in 7 dark places, as *they that be dead of old*. He hath hedged me about, that I cannot 8 get out: he hath made my chain heavy. Also, when I cry and shout, he shutteth 9 out my prayer. He hath inclosed my ways with hewn stone: he hath made my paths crooked.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 4.—Jeremiah uses כָּשַׁר often, vii. 21; xii. 12, etc.; עָוִר, once, xiii. 23. The two words occur in connection, especially in Leviticus, xiii. 2-4; xi. 38, 39. Comp. besides Job xix. 20, Prov. v. 11; Lam. iv. 8; v. 10.

Ver. 5.—יָקַהּ involves, like שָׁנַב, ver. 3, an adverbial relation to the principal verb, see ver. 3. [There is no necessity for this construction here, nor are the verbs so nearly synonymous as to render this construction likely. It is better to take the two verbs as having the same relation to עָלַי, and the same subjective accusative in בָּנָה וְרָאשׁ וְהִלָּאָה. GESENIUS: "God hath builded against me, obstructed me, shut up my way on every side so that I cannot get out."—W. H. H.] —הִקְיָה—, elsewhere frequently in the sense *circumare* (see Jos. vi. 3; Ps. xvii. 9; xlviii. 13, etc.), means also *circumponere*, and that which is placed around in the accusative by itself. So also Job xix. 6. The word is not found in Jeremiah.—רָאשׁ (in Jeremiah only in the connection רָאשׁ מֵי, viii. 14; ix. 14; xxxiii. 15) is of uncertain derivation, but indicates undoubtedly *poison* (see Deut. xxix. 17; xxxii. 32, 33; Lam. iii. 19). The word connected with it, הִלָּאָה, does not occur in Jeremiah, although he used the verb לָאָה, comparatively speaking, frequently, vi. 11; ix. 4; xii. 5; xv. 6; xx. 3. The meaning is *difficulty, labor*, Ex. xviii. 8; Num. xx. 14; Neh. ix. 32; Mal. i. 13.

Ver. 6.—כִּחְשָׁבִים, not in Jeremiah.—הוֹשֵׁב, Jer. xxxii. 37. [This word does not imply the *posture of sitting*, as HENDERSON imagines, when he says the language may refer "to an ancient custom of placing the dead bodies in a sitting posture in the sepulchres."—W. H. H.]

Ver. 7.—נָדָר, Jeremiah never uses. [Observe, this is an initial word. See *Intr., Add. Rem.* (6), p. 31.—W. H. H.] —וְלֹא־נָצַח is found in Ps. lxxxviii. 9, word for word. For the construction [of וְ] with the future, *that I could not go forth* see my *Gr.*, § 89, 3 b, 2; § 109, 3.—הַכְּבִיד is, to say the least, foreign to Jeremiah's style. Comp. 1 Kings xii. 10, 14.—נִחְשֶׁת, in the sense of a *fetter*, only here; elsewhere נִחְשָׁתִים, Jer. xxxix. 7; lii. 11, etc.

Ver. 8.—וַעֲקָ, in the sense of *crying to God*, frequently with Jeremiah, for example xi. 11, 12; xx. 8; xxv. 34.—The verb שָׁנַע (see Ps. lxxxviii. 14) used only in Piel, does not occur in Jeremiah; he uses only the substantive derived from it שְׁנֵי, which also occurs in our chapter, ver. 56.—The verb שָׁתַם, thus written, occurs only here. It is merely a scribal variety of כָּתַם, see שָׁכַן ii. 6. Jeremiah uses neither. The sense is *obstruere* (of wells, Gen. xxvi. 15, 18; 2 Kings iii. 19, 25), *occludere, recludere* (of prophetic mysteries, Dan. viii. 26; iv. 9). [MICHAELIS, ROSENMUELLER, GERLACH: *Obstruxit precibus meis viam qua pervenire ad suas aures possint.*]

Ver. 9.—נִתְּיָה, not in Jeremiah. May there not be an allusion to stones with which the grave is built up? —וְהָיָה הָעֵינַי דְּרָכָם, iii. 21, הָיָה הָעֵינַי, ix. 4. That נִתְּיָה indicates the destruction of the *via munita*, as THENIUS would have it, I do not believe. For in Is. xxiv. 1, עֵינָה signifies not *evertere*, but *pervertere*. [GERLACH: "נִתְּיָה" is not a carefully constructed causeway (THENIUS), which is rather the meaning of כְּסֵלָה, but is rather the path worn by the steps of the traveller, then any small by-road (see Jer. xviii. 15, where כְּסֵלָה לֹא דֶרֶךְ is added epexegetically to נִתְּיָה)."]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

It may be observed here that the speaker, having in the introductory verses 1-3 designated himself, in general terms, as the man most severely punished, now proceeds to prove this in detail.

Ver. 4. He begins with direct personal sufferings in his flesh, skin and bones. **My flesh and my skin hath he made old.**—*He wasted away my flesh and my skin.* The verb rendered *he made old*, in the Kal, has an intransitive signification, *atteri, consumi*, to be wasted away by attrition, to be consumed, especially of garments (Deut. viii. 4; xxix. 5; comp. Is. i. 9; li. 6) and of the bodily faculties (Gen. xviii. 12) in the Piel, which is used here, it means *atterere*, to *wear out by attrition* [the verb means to *rub*], *consumere*,

to *consume, waste away*; it is found in this sense, besides here, in Ps. xlix. 15; Job xxi. 13; Is. lxxv. 22; 1 Chron. xvii. 19.—**He hath broken my bones.** *He broke* (see ii. 9) *my bones* [HENDERSON: *Broke in pieces*]. The same phrase occurs in Is. xxxviii. 13. See Ps. li. 10; Job xxx. 17, and the declaration of the contrary in Ps. xxxiv. 21. [The breaking of the bones indicate, not only the loss of physical strength, but a condition of great suffering. "The bones are often represented in the Scriptures as the seat of acute pain" (BARNES.) Job xx. 11; xxx. 17; Ps. vi. 2; xxii. 14; xxxi. 10; xxxviii. 3; xlii. 10; Prov. xiv. 30. We can only take the phrase here in the metaphorical sense. He was suffering both physical weakness and physical pain.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 5. Now follow the hindrances which have been raised against him from without. And first he says, he had been built around with poison

and trouble.—**He hath builded against me and compassed me with gall and travail.** *He built up against me and round about me poison and difficulty.* [*He built around me, and encompassed [me] with bitterness and distress.*—W. H. H.] The image of a beleaguered city lies at the foundation of the thought here. But we are not, with the older commentators, to supply *wall* (כִּנּוּר), or some similar word after the verb *built*, but rather are to take *gall and travail* [poison and difficulty] as the object of that verb. The connection of words and thoughts here is singular, and has not up to the present time been sufficiently elucidated. Perhaps the Poet would say that the Lord had surrounded him, not only with hardships of every sort, but with adversities in themselves ruinous. It is however possible that in the word *poison*, שָׂרָר, the idea of bitterness (see Ps. lxi. 22) may predominate. Any way a sudden transition, from a figurative to a literal style of speaking, is effected. [There is perhaps no more difficulty here than is created by an attempt to reduce a metaphorical expression to the terms of a literal and actual fact. To enclose and encompass one with bitterness and trouble or distress (using the abstract for the concrete, *i. e.*, with circumstances causing bitterness and distress), as if these were obstructing walls, is undoubtedly the sense of our text, and is adopted by most of the versions and commentators.—W. H. H.]

[The SEPT., the TARG. and the ARAB. (not the VULG. as BLAYNEY says), render שָׂרָר, as if it were שָׂרַר, *my head*. But these and all the ancient versions translate the same word in ver. 19, by *gall*. The SEPT. also translates תִּלְאָה as a verb, ἐμύχθησεν. BLAYNEY adopts these readings of the SEPT., but instead of elucidating the meaning, confuses it still more by a new translation of the first clause: “He hath built upon me, and encompassed my head, so that it is weary.” HENDERSON adopts partially the SEPT. translation, but discovers a new and doubtful meaning for the second verb, רָקַץ, *He hath builded against me and struck me on the head, and it is distressed*. FUERST proposes (See his Lex. under the word תִּלְאָה) to carry out the military idea suggested by the verbs, thus; *He has surrounded me with fortifications and a trench*. But it is hardly necessary to accept the new and unauthorized derivations of these words, when their frequent use gives us a sense, that is, indeed, metaphorical, but none the less clear and expressive, and sustained so generally by the Versions, old and new.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 6. To the obstructions of the way are added the obstructions of light. This whole verse is reproduced word for word in Ps. cxliii. 3.—**He hath set me in dark places.** *He caused me to dwell in darkness.*—**As they that be dead of old.**—*As the dead of olden time.* Ps. lxxxviii. 5-7 and 11-13, afford the best commentary on this. There are those dead before the appointed time, whom the Lord remembers no more, and to whom He shows no more the wonders of His grace. The expression is found only here and in Ps. cxliii. 3. [We may translate it either *the dead of*

old, or the forever dead. BLAYNEY: “God had involved him in such a depth of distress, that he was as incapable of extricating himself, as those who had laid long in the dark mansions of the dead were of making their escape thence.” GERLACH; “He is thrust into the darkness of the grave (Ps. lxxxviii. 5, 6), or of Sheol (Ps. lxxxviii. 7; Job x. 21, 22)—as an image of distress, Ps. xxx. 2; lxxxviii.—*like the dead of eternity, the forever dead* (Vulg., *mortui sempiterni*).—Most commentators (MICHAELIS, ROSENMUELLER, MAURER, DE WETTE, EWALD, THENIUS, NEUMANN, BÖTTCHER) explain, *the dead of old*=those a long time dead; but whether dead a long or a short time makes no difference, and this, as CONZ has correctly remarked, ‘would occasion an absurd ambiguity, as if the dead, who have been but a little while dead and buried, might not lie in darkness.’ The CHAL.: *Mortui qui vadunt in alterum seculum (mundum).*”—W. H. H.]

Ver. 7. A climax! Not only has the Lord surrounded him with obstacles and deprived him of light, but He has also taken away his freedom. He is imprisoned and fettered! **He hath hedged me about, that I cannot get out.** *He hedged me in that I could not get out* [or, *that I should not escape, or go forth.*—The very words of Christ in the passion psalm, lxxxviii. 9 (WORDSWORTH)]. **He hath made my chain heavy,**—*He made heavy my chain, or fetter.*

Ver. 8. The Lord accepts none of the sufferer’s prayers. He hears him not. [HENDERSON: “The prophet places himself in the position of a prisoner, who is securely immured, and to whose supplications for deliverance, how earnestly soever they may be made, no attention is paid.”] **Also when I cry and shout, he shutteth out my prayer.** *Also though I cry and call for help, my prayer has he barred or bolted.* [The idea is, *hindered or obstructed*. He has taken means, by anticipation, to prevent my prayer for help from being heard, either by Himself, or by any other who might possibly come to the rescue. The change from the future tenses, to the preterite tense, seems to indicate this meaning.—W. H. H.] The sense cannot be that the Lord prevented the prayer from going out of the man’s heart, for in fact he cried (see ROSENMUELLER *in loc.*), but that He shut up the way of access to His own ear and heart. Comp. ver. 44; Prov. i. 28. [WORDSWORTH: “So the suffering Messiah says, Ps. xxii. 2, “O my God, I cry in the daytime, but Thou hearest not.” GERLACH: “However loudly he prays, the Lord has closed His ear; ver. 44; Job xix. 8; Is. i. 15; Jer. vii. 16; Ps. xviii. 42; Prov. i. 28.”]

Ver. 9. The right way is built up against the Poet, so that he seems compelled to false ways.—**He hath inclosed—he hedged in** [same word as in ver. 7]—**my ways with hewn stones.** If hewn, then large stones, for we do not build with small ones. Comp. Ex. xx. 25; 1 Kings v. 31; Is. ix. 9; Am. v. 11; Ezek. xl. 42.—**He hath made—he made—my paths crooked.** The Poet would say that he had been forced to crooked and false paths. See *crooked ways*, Ps. cxxv. 5; *crooked things*, Is. xlii. 16. [At the first glance this would seem to be a continuation of the figure contained in verses 7, 8. This impression is due to the repetition of the word רָקַץ, *hedged*

in, and to the climax implied by *hewn stone*. The idea, in that case, is, that having imprisoned him and loaded him with fetters and shut out his cry for help, God proceeds, as it were, to make his imprisonment permanent and secure, by building up around him a wall of hewn stone. If this is so, then the last clause cannot mean *He made my paths crooked*, for one in the situation described must remain an inactive, passive sufferer; but it would mean that God had made all paths of escape impassable. The principal avenues of escape (הַרְכָּבִי) are built up with hewn stones, barriers that cannot be scaled. The smaller paths (נְתִיבוֹתַי) are broken up, turned upside down, and thus rendered impassable. This is GERLACH's view. It is better, however, to regard this verse as introducing a new metaphor, which is continued in ver. 10. "He next conceives of himself as a traveller whose way is blocked up by a solid wall, and who, being compelled to turn aside into the devious pathways of the forest, is exposed to the rapacity of wild beasts" (HENDERSON). This view is recommended by the following considerations. 1. The figure of an immured and fettered prisoner is already complete, and could receive no additional force from what is here said. 2. The repetition of the verb נָכַר, *hedged in*, which in ordinary cases would indicate a continuance

of the same subject, is accounted for here by the necessity of a word with the same initial letter. 3. The expressions "*my ways*" and "*my paths*," favor this construction. They are *his*, because he is expected to pursue them. Were they simply the ways and paths of possible escape from the place of confinement, they would not, strictly speaking, be *his* at all, for he could not use them. 4. This explanation makes the next verse less abrupt, and produces a regular and beautiful succession of metaphorical pictures. 5. The idea of simply breaking up or turning over the *by-paths*, as expressed by the Hebrew verb הִפְתֵּן, does not correspond with the security against escape expressed by building up the main avenues of escape with hewn stone. 6. The common translation, *He made my path crooked*, best agrees with the force of the Hebrew verb, and is adopted with great unanimity by the Versions and commentators. OWEN: "The meaning is *turned aside*. He had built, as it were, a wall of hewn stones across his way, and thus He turned aside his goings or his paths, so that he was constrained to take some other course." WORDSWORTH: "Not only hath He blocked up my way with hewn stones, but He has turned my paths aside from their proper direction." So E. V., BROUGHTON, CALVIN, BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, and NOYES.—W. H. H.]

III. 10-18.

10, 11 He *was* unto me as a bear lying in wait, *and* as a lion in secret places. He hath turned aside my ways, and pulled me in pieces: he hath made me desolate. He hath bent his bow, and set me as a mark for the arrow. He hath caused the arrows of his quiver to enter into my reins. I was a derision to all my people, *and* their song all the day. He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood. He hath also broken my teeth with gravel-stones, he hath covered me with ashes. And thou hast removed my soul far off from peace: I forgot prosperity. And I said, My strength and my hope is perished from the LORD.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 10.—Jeremiah never mentions bears. [The need of an initial ד would naturally suggest the bear in connection with the lion. See *Intr., Add. Rem.* (6), p. 31.—W. H. H.]—Jeremiah uses אָרַב only once, in the phrase הַכִּינִי הָאֲרָבִים, li. 12,—*קִטְרֵרִים* Jeremiah uses often, xiii. 17; xxiii. 24; xlix. 10.

Ver. 11.—כָּשָׁן, *ān. Aeyōu*. In the Aramaic it stands for נָתַח *in frustra dissecuit* (Lev. i. 6, 12), for טָפַח *dilaniavit* (Job xvi. 9), for שָׁכַח *dissecuit*, פָּרַק *fregit* (1 Sam. xv. 33; Ps. vii. 3). See CHR. B. MICHAELIS in ROSENMTUELLER and GES. *Thes.*, p. 1153.—For relation of שָׁכַח to Jeremiah's style and use of language, see i. 4. שָׁוִן Jeremiah uses not infrequently, xii. 11; xiii. 16; xvii. 5, etc. שָׁוִן would be suggested here as alliterative with preceding word.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 12.—הַצִּיב In Jer. v. 26; xxxi. 21—*כְּמָרָה*, in the sense of *custodia*, a place of custody, frequently in Jeremiah, xxxii. 2, 12, etc. In the sense of a mark, only here, Job xvi. 12, and 1 Sam. xx. 20. See GESEN. *Thes.*, p. 511 s. v. חֵץ. With regard to its Aramaic termination א—(see יִשְׁנָה, iv. 1). See OLSH., § 38 f., 108 e [GREEN'S *Gr.*, § 196 d]. This is no evidence against Jeremiatic authorship, since, not only analogies occur in Jeremiah (see דָּשָׁא, i. 11; נָשָׂא, xxiii. 39), but scattered examples occur also in older books. See OLSH. as above.—חֵץ, Jer. ix. 7; i. 9, 14, etc.

Ver. 13.—Iliph. הִכְיָא often in Jeremiah, iii. 14; xx. 5; xxv. 9, 13, etc.—Jeremiah also uses אֲשַׁפָּה (v. 15), but בָּנֵי חֵץ occurs only here. The arrow is called בְּנֵי־רֶשֶׁת in Job xli. 20. See בְּנֵי־רֶשֶׁת, sons of flame, of lightning, by which many interpreters understand arrows, others sparks, and others birds. See also יִצְהָר, Zech. iv. 14; בְּנֵי־שֶׁבֶן, Is. v. 1.

Ver. 14.—The words הֵייתִי שָׁחֹק הֵייתִי are taken from Jer. xx. 7, where it is said, לֵשְׁחֹק כָּל־הַיּוֹם כָּלָה לִי לֵנֶה לִי, הֵייתִי לִשְׁחֹק כָּל־הַיּוֹם כָּלָה לִי לֵנֶה לִי. Jeremiah never uses. See Lam. iii. 63; v. 14.

Ver. 15.—Jeremiah uses Hiph. **הִשְׁבִּיץ**, v. 7.—**מְרוּרִים**, besides here only in Ex. xii. 8; Num. ix. 11.—Hiph. **הִרְוָה**, Jer. xxi. 25.—**לְעֵנָה**, *wormwood*, *absinthium*, Jeremiah uses in ix. 14; xxiii. 15.

Ver. 16.—The verb **נָצַח**, *contundere, comminere*, is found besides here only in Ps. cxix. 20.—The verb **כָּפַשׁ** occurs only here. It is in Hiph., and means *obruit, cooperuit*. [All the ancient Versions seem to have considered **כָּפַשׁ** same as **כָּבַשׁ**. The Sept., *ἐξωμύσεν με σποδόν*, is rendered by Vulg. *cibavit me cinere*, “as if from **כָּבַשׁ** came the Latin word *cibus*” (BLAYNEY); but this meaning cannot be extracted from the fundamental sense of the root (see FUERST). The Targ. rendered it *laid low*, which gives good sense, and is adopted by BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, OWEN and C. B. MICHAELIS. The Arabic, *rolled me in the ashes*, which is adopted by LUTHER, E. V. marg., J. D. MICHAELIS and EWALD. The Syr. *besprinkled, or covered*, which is generally accepted as the correct meaning.—W. H. H.]—**אָפַר** in Jeremiah only in the kindred expression **הַתְּפִלִּישִׁי**, **נָאֶפֶר**, vi. 26; Comp. Ezek. xxvii. 30.

Ver. 17.—**וְנָח** Jeremiah never uses: see ii. 7.—**נִשָּׂה**, Jer. xxiii. 39.—**טֹכָה** frequently in Jeremiah, xiv. 11; xviii. 10, 20, etc.

Ver. 18.—**אָכַר**. See ver. 54; Jer. iii. 17, 19.—**נָצַח**. Only **נָצַח** occurs in Jeremiah, and that with reference to time, duration.—**תּוֹחֶלֶת**, Jeremiah never uses: but see Prov. xi. 7; Ezek. xix. 5; xxxvii. 11.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 10. While in what precedes we were told how the sufferer was deprived of all means of escape, what follows describes the positive weapons of offence with which he was assaulted. [By regarding ver. 9 as in close connection with what precedes, the introduction of the bear and lion in ver. 10 is abrupt and irrelevant. A prisoner, closely immured, has nothing to fear from bears and lions lurking in their coverts. Connect ver. 9 with ver. 10, however, and the sense is apparent. A traveller, prevented by barricades and stone walls from pursuing the way he would go, is compelled to follow crooked paths environed with danger of encountering lurking wild beasts. See notes on ver. 9.—W. H. H.]—**He was unto me as a bear lying in wait, and as a lion in secret places.** *A lurking bear was he to me,—a lion in ambush.* The image of a bear lying in wait occurs only here. See, however, Hos. xiii. 7, 8; Am. v. 19; Prov. xxviii. 15. The figure of a lion lying in wait occurs in Jeremiah xlix. 19; i. 14; comp. ii. 30; iv. 7; v. 6; xii. 8. Elsewhere, see Ps. x. 9; xvii. 12.

Ver. 11. Bears or lions, when they attack a flock, spring upon them, tear the sheep in pieces and leave those they do not eat weltering alone in their blood. This last has happened to the Poet. **He hath turned aside my ways—he drove me aside.** *He hath made my ways turn aside* [lit.], that is to say, *He drives me from the right, direct way.* **And pulled me in pieces, he hath made me desolate.** *He tore me in pieces and cast me away lonely and miserable.* Should we translate, *He tore me to pieces, mutilated me*, and understand this to mean that the wild beast had eaten his victim, then this would not suit the other figures used in the text. On this account, we must understand this tearing in pieces only in the sense of *discerpere, of mangling, lacerating*. So EWALD, *mich zerrupfend*. The Poet would say that the beast of prey had seized one of the scattered flock, had throttled it and left it for dead, lying alone in its misery. For we must carefully observe the two ideas expressed here in the last Hebrew word, **שָׁוִים**, that of *desolation, destruction* (see i. 4, 13, 16), and that of *solitariness, loneliness* (Is. liv. 1; 2 Sam. xiii. 20). [This word, **שָׁוִים**, may express any object of suffering

forsaken of God and men, exciting, therefore, either pity or astonishment. See the use of the verb and its derivatives in ch. i.: Is. liv. 1; Job xvi. 7; xxi. 5; Ps. cxliii. 4. The fundamental signification of the root is to be motionless, filled with dread. This is the idea here. A solitary sheep, torn by the wild beast, lying alone in its suffering, and apparently dead. *He made me desolate*, or a desolation, may be a literal translation, but does not convey the sense which can only be done by inventing a phrase, as NÆGELSBACH has done. The idea is best condensed, perhaps, in the words, *He left me suffering and alone.*—W. H. H.]

סִוִּר cannot be taken here in the sense it always has elsewhere, *refractorius, rebellis*. The word in this sense is Part. Kal. of **סָרַר**, and occurs only in Hos. iv. 16. Here it can only be, either Pilel of **סָרַר** [so DAVIDSON], or Poel of **סָרַר** (OLSH. § 254). It is, in either case, a verbal form, occurring nowhere except here, and meaning *He made my ways turn aside*, that is to say, he drove me from the right, direct way. THENIUS lays too much stress on the word, when he translates, *He has dragged me aside*. [The idea is, He causes me to diverge from the way, to escape the lurking beast; but in vain, for he springs upon me, rends me, and leaves me weltering in blood. BLAYNEY gives us an original translation of his own. “*He hath turned full upon me.*” **סָרַר** is applied, Hos. iv. 16, to a refractory heifer, that turns aside, and will not go forward in the straight track, as she is directed. Here it is to be understood of a bear or lion turning aside toward a traveller, to fall upon him in his way.” GERLACH understands the word here to signify *turning back*, instead of *turning aside*, that is, arresting the fugitive and sending him back to prison. But neither the context, nor the signification of the word allow of this sense. JARCHI, according to GERLACH, regarded **סִוִּר**, as a denominative from **סָרַר**, *spinis opplevit vias meas*. So HUGH BROUGHTON, *My ways hath He made thorny.*—W. H. H.]

Ver. 12. In a new figure the Poet describes the Lord as an archer, who has made him his mark. [HENDERSON: “The idea of a hunter was naturally suggested by the circumstances just referred to. This is beautifully expressed in language borrowed from such employment.”] **He hath bent—He bent—his bow.**—See. ii. 4

And set me as a—the—mark for the arrow. The second half of the verse seems to be an imitation of Job xvi. 12.

Ver. 13. Continuation of the figure employed in ver. 12. **He hath caused the arrows of his quiver to enter into my reins.**—*He shot into my reins the sons of his quiver.* The Lord not only aims at the mark, He hits it, and that right in the centre. The reins are here regarded as the central organs, as frequently with Jeremiah (xi. 20; xii. 2; xvii. 10; xx. 12), not in a physical sense, however, but in a psychological sense, as appears from ver. 14. See DELITZSCH *Psychologie*, § 13, p. 268, 2d Edition.—The expression *sons of the quiver*, occurs only here. ROSEN-MUELLER quotes not inappropriately the *pharetra gravida sagittis* of HORACE (*Ode* I. 22, 23).

Ver. 14. It happens here that the Poet suddenly loses the figure. But it seems as if he would indicate by means of ver. 14, that by the arrows of which he spoke in ver. 13, he meant the arrows of derision. Jeremiah ix. 7 explicitly calls the *deceitful tongue* (לִשְׁוֹן מַרְכָּה), a *sharpened arrow* (חֵץ שְׁחוּטִים). See Is. xlix. 2.—**I was a derision to all my people.**—*I have become a laughing stock to all my people.* Altogether unnecessarily many interpreters (even THENIUS and EWALD) take עַמִּי, *my people*, as a rare plural form for עַמִּים, *peoples, nations* (as, it is asserted, in 2 Sam. xxii. 44; Ps. cxliv. 2. See EWALD, § 177 a). This rests on the presumption that the subject of the Lamentation is not the Prophet, but the people of Israel. We have already above, at vers. 1-3, declared ourselves against this opinion, and will return to the question again below, at ver. 40 sqq. [HENDERSON; “Instead of עַמִּי *my people*, a considerable number of MSS. read עַמִּים, and four הָעַמִּים in the plural; but this reading, though supported by the Syr., seems less suitable than the former. There is no evidence that the Prophet was treated otherwise than with respect by foreigners. Instead of meeting with any consideration from his countrymen, fidelity in the discharge of his duty to whom had been the occasion of all his personal troubles, he was made the butt of their ridicule, and the theme of their satirical songs.” See Jer. xx. 7.] **And their song all the day.** [The conjunction and is not in the original, and is omitted by NAGELSBACH.—W. H. H.] The expression, *their song* (שִׁירָם), is from Job xxx. 9; comp. xii. 4; Ps. lxi. 8-13.

Ver. 15. After the short interruption of ver. 14, the Poet returns to the figurative style of speaking. He exhausts, as it were, his stock of images, in order to depict the adversities which befell him. He must also receive them as meat and drink, and that too in copious measure, and he must be covered with them as with ashes. [SCOTT: Vers. 14-16. “In the midst of his other troubles, the prophet was derided and insulted by the people, over whose approaching calamities he so pathetically mourned; and they made him the subject of their profane songs, for which they were at length made a derision and a song to their enemies. Thus the Lord filled him with bitterness and intoxicated him with the nauseous cup, of which he was made to drink, instead of the cordials that his case seemed

to require: and instead of nourishing, palatable food, his bread was as it were mixed with gravel, which brake his teeth, and put him to great pain when he attempted to eat: and he was covered with ashes, as a constant mourner and penitent.”] —**He hath filled me with bitterness** (marg., bitternesses). *He satiated me with bitterness.* [The Hebrew verb is used to denote satiety after eating, Deut. vi. 11; Hosea iv. 10. The connection seems to require this sense here. He was required to eat *bitter things*, or *bitter herbs* (see FUERST'S *Lex.*), and drink wormwood till he was filled.—W. H. H.] —**He hath made me drunken with wormwood.**—*He made me drunk with [or, made me drink to excess of] wormwood.* See ver. 19.

Ver. 16. **He hath also broken** [lit. *And he broke*. Vers. 16-18 each, begin with *and* (or *oav* conversive) for the sake of the initial letter, which is translated here *also*. It can be omitted in translation altogether, though it may denote here an intimate connection between this verse and ver. 15, as between *eating* and *drinking*.—W. H. H.] **My teeth with gravel stones.**—*He broke my teeth with pebbles.* It is a matter of indifference whether we regard this as meaning bread mixed with stones, or stones instead of bread. **He hath covered me with ashes.**—*He covered me with ashes.* The ashes here seem to be intended as a symbol of mourning, as they are in the well-known usages of mourning. See 2 Sam. xiii. 19; Job ii. 8; Mic. i. 10.

לִפְתָּי, *lapillus*, a little stone, occurs besides here only in Prov. xx. 17 (Ps. lxxvii. 18). [Prov. xx. 17, “Bread of deceit is sweet to a man; but afterwards his mouth shall be filled with gravel,” seems to be an allusion to the grit that often is mixed with bread baked in ashes, and thus may explain this passage. BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, OWEN and HENDERSON, translate the word *grit*. HENDERSON'S inelegant translation, *He hath made my teeth cranch grit*, and EWALD'S *er liess meine Zähne zermalmen Steine*, is inconsistent with the use of the preposition בְּ, the presumptive power of the verb נָרַם (see GERLACH), and the apparent meaning of this passage especially when compared with Prov. xx. 17,—the pebbles were not broken by the teeth, but the teeth were broken by the pebbles.—A curious result of translating from a translation is exhibited in the *Vulga*. The SEPT. having rendered this Ἐξέβαλεν ψῆφον τοῖς ὀδόντας μου, the *Vulga*, taking ψῆφος as *calculus arithmeticus*, translated *Et fregit ad numerum* (in full number, or by number, DOUAY “one by one”) *dentes meos*.—W. H. H.]

Vers. 17, 18. These verses constitute the conclusion and culmination point of the Lamentation. The speaker, dropping the metaphorical and adopting the literal style, utters a threefold declaration. 1. That the Lord had thrust him back, as it were, from the dominion of peace (שָׁלוֹם, *peace*, is to be taken in its broadest sense, see below). To this objective act, what follows corresponds as subjective. 2. That the speaker has been deprived of all happiness, even to the recollection of it. 3. That he—and this is the acme of his sorrow—regarded even his confidence and hope in Jehovah as destroyed.

Ver. 17. **And thou hast removed my soul far off from peace.**—*Thou thrustest away my soul from peace.* This is a quotation from Ps. lxxxviii. 15, which Psalm our Poet so often avails himself of. This explains why the Poet so suddenly addresses God in the second person. [WORDSWORTH: "By an affecting transition, the Prophet turns to the Almighty, whom he sees present, and addresses Him, *Thou hast removed my soul far off from peace*; adopting the language of another Passion Psalm [lxxxviii. 14-18]."]

Peace (שָׁלוֹם) is happiness in the widest sense, as often, and stands in parallelism with *good* (טוֹבָה). See Jer. viii. 15; xiv. 9, "We looked for peace, but no good came." **I forgot prosperity** (מַרְגָּ, *good*).—*I forgot good.* The speaker has been deprived of all happiness, even to the recollection of it. [LOWTH: "So Joseph speaking of the seven years of famine saith that 'plenty shall be forgotten in the land of Egypt.'"]

Many old translators take נַפְשִׁי as the subject of וְהוֹנָח. JEROME: *Expulsa est a pace anima mea.* VENET. GR.: 'Απείσθη ἡ ἐνὶ ψυχῇ. SYRIAC: *data est oblivioni a pace anima mea.* [CALVIN: *El remota fuit a pace anima mea.* BROUGHTON: *and my soul is cast off from peace.*] But these translations evidently proceed from philological ignorance. For נַפֵּשׁ is never used intransitively (not even in Hos. viii. 5). These translators seem also to have stumbled at the fact that here suddenly God is addressed in the second person. Among the moderns also, THENIUS and EWALD take נַפְשִׁי as the subject. But they take נִחַנָּה likewise in a sense it never has, namely, of loathing. THENIUS translates, *so that I loathe happiness.* EWALD: *Happiness has become loathsome to me.* To this we object, because no one ever feels a loathing of happiness,—nor is שָׁלוֹם equivalent to life, in which case it might indicate a satiety or weariness of life, but שָׁלוֹם is the enjoyment of life. They have overlooked the fact that this passage is a quotation from Ps. lxxxviii. 15, of which our Poet so often avails himself. There it is said לִמְדָה הָיְתָה הַנִּחָנָה נַפְשִׁי. This explains why the Poet so suddenly addresses God in the second person, and determines the meaning of נַחַן, which can only be, as everywhere else, *re-jicere, repellere*. That נִחַן is construed with כֵּן (as elsewhere only once, in Hiphil, 2 Chron. xi. 14) need not surprise us, for there is nothing in the word itself that would make this construction appear as unauthorized or even strange. [GERLACH, while rejecting the opinions of THENIUS and EWALD, adopts the idea of the old translators, *Und es ward verstossen vom Frieden meine Seele*, and strangely appeals to 2 Chron. xi. 14, to justify the intransitive use of the verb.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 18. **And I said, My strength and my hope is perished from the Lord.**—*Over and gone from Jehovah is my confidence and hope.* [BROUGHTON: *And I thought in myself, my state is undone and my hope from the Eternal.* HENDERSON: *And I said, My confidence is perished, and my hope from Jehovah.* Not only had all present en-

joyment been annihilated, but all prospect of future prosperity had been cut off."] The Poet here represents the sum total, as it were, of his punishment, the separate details, which he has been narrating, beginning at ver. 1, being regarded as the several items of a sum in arithmetic. The result is an alarming one. His confidence and his hope in the Lord had been almost destroyed by the unintermitted blows of the rod of wrath (vers. 1-3). But they had not been actually destroyed. This we learn from the expression, *and I said*, וָאָמַר. Without this word ver. 18 would have a much more equivocal sense. But this indicates that the Poet would represent the loss of his confidence, not as an actual fact (else he would have said וְנִאָּחַזְרָה), but as merely an anticipatory thought. He said, *i. e.*, he thought so to himself, as in Jer. iii. 7, וָאָמַר represents merely a speaking to one's self, *i. e.*, a thought, a feeling. [See instances of this use of the expression in Gen. xxvi. 9; 1 Sam. xx. 3; 2 Sam. xxi. 16; 1 Kings viii. 12, *etc.*—W. H. H.] That he had not actually lost his confidence is, finally, most apparent from what follows, where the Poet, with all his soul's energy, refastens the bond of confidence that had threatened to break. [HENRY: "Without doubt it was his infirmity to say thus, Ps. lxxvii. 10, for with God there is *everlasting strength*, and He is His people's never failing hope, whatever they may think."]

נָכַר followed by כֵּן, has different senses. This כֵּן often indicates the person or place suffering the loss; אָבַר כְּנֹס כִּפְנֵי; Ps. cxlii. 5; comp. Job xi. 20; xviii. 17; Jer. xviii. 18; xxv. 35; xlix. 7, 38, *etc.* It can be taken thus here. For the thought that Jehovah has *lost* the confidence of the Poet, can be expressed in the form here used. Yet it is well to observe here that the words cannot be translated, *my confidence and my hope in Jehovah are lost* [as NOYES does]. For the object of confidence is always indicated

by עַל, אֶל, or, as especially after הוֹחֵלֶת, Ps. xxxix. 8, by לִי. But the sense is, *my confidence is perished away from Jehovah*, it has lost its direction towards Him. It is a *constructio pægnans*: my confidence is turned away from God, and thus has become destroyed. כֵּן could also be taken with reference to the efficient cause. See אֲבָרוּ מְנַסְּחָה אֵלָיו יֵאָבְרוּ, Job iv. 9; Ps. lxxx. 17. [So BLAYNEY and BOOTHROYD: *Jehovah hath caused my strength and my hope to fail.*] Yet, if כֵּן had only this sense, and not at the same time the local sense of *away from*, we would rather expect כִּמְנֵי, as we read Ps. lxxviii. 3, אֲבָרוּ רַשְׁעִים כִּמְנֵי אֱלֹהִים, נְצַח. That this root contains the ideas of splendor, strength and endurance, is certain. Which is its original meaning is disputed. Here, as in 1 Sam. v. 29, the idea seems to be strength with the modification of perseverance, persevering steadfastness and confidence. At least this best suits the intimately connected word הוֹחֵלֶת.

PART II.

III. 19-42.

- † Ver. 19. Remember my affliction and my wandering,
 The wormwood and the gall.
 † Ver. 20. Yea, Thou wilt indeed remember
 That my soul is bowed down in me.
 † Ver. 21. This will I take to my heart,
 Therefore will I hope.
 □ Ver. 22. Because of Jehovah's mercies, we are not consumed;
 For His compassions fail not:
 □ Ver. 23. They are new every morning:
 Great is Thy faithfulness.
 □ Ver. 24. My portion is Jehovah, saith my soul;
 Therefore will I hope in Him.
 ▢ Ver. 25. Good is Jehovah to them that wait for Him,
 To the soul that seeketh Him.
 ▢ Ver. 26. Good is it both to hope and silently wait
 For the salvation of Jehovah.
 ▢ Ver. 27. Good is it for a man,
 That he bear the yoke in his youth.
 ' Ver. 28. He sitteth alone and is silent,
 Because HE imposed it upon him:
 ' Ver. 29. He putteth his mouth in the dust,
 Peradventure, there may be hope!
 ' Ver. 30. He offereth his cheek to him that smiteth him;
 He is filled with reproach.
 ▣ Ver. 31. For the Lord will not cast off
 Forever!
 ▣ Ver. 32. For though HE hath caused grief.
 Yet is HE moved to compassion according to His great mercy.
 ▣ Ver. 33. For HE doth not willingly afflict
 And grieve the children of men.
 ♪ Ver. 34. To trample under his feet
 All prisoners of the earth,—
 ♪ Ver. 35. To deprive a man of his rights
 Before the face of the Most High,—
 ♪ Ver. 36. To subvert a man in his cause,—
 The Lord approveth not!
 ♪ Ver. 37. Who is he that spoke and it was done,
 Except the Lord commanded?
 ♪ Ver. 38. Cometh not the evil as well as the good
 From the mouth of the Most High?
 ♪ Ver. 39. Why murmur living men—
 Every one for his sins?
 ♪ Ver. 40. Let us search and try our ways,
 And return to Jehovah.
 ♪ Ver. 41. Let us lift up our heart together with our hands
 To God in the Heavens.
 ♪ Ver. 42. WE—have sinned and rebelled.
 THOU—hast not pardoned.

ANALYSIS.

In the second part, vers. 19-42, the Poet rises out of the night of sorrow into the clear day of comfort and hope; yet he allows, as it were, a morning dawn to precede, and an evening twilight to follow this day. Vers. 19-21 contain a transition. The Poet can again pray! He prays the Lord to be once more mindful of him, vers. 19, 20; and on his own part he sets about to seek for grounds of comfort, ver. 21. These he finds, first of all, in the fact that Israel is not completely destroyed, that there is yet a remnant, as a starting point for a return to the better fortune which is now at hand. This fact is due to the grace and mercy of God, the continuation of which the Poet recognizes with the deepest joy, vers. 22-24. From this point of view, afforded by the Divine mercy, the Poet now looks upon his sorrows:—the Lord even when He smites, always means it for good, vers. 25-27;—if it be borne patiently, with silent submission, vers. 28-30,—then the rays of Divine compassion will again appear, vers. 31-33. Viewed from this stand-point, every sorrow, even that inflicted upon us by human malignity, seems a wholesome divine ordinance,—so that not the sorrow itself, but only the sin that caused it, is to be deplored, vers. 34-39. Such a lamentation for sin, the cause of the affliction suffered, the Poet now begins, not in his own name, but in that of all the people, vers. 40-42. And as he had skilfully introduced this lamentation by the self-accusation in ver. 39, so these three verses, 40-42, serve him as a means of transition to a new lamentation over the misfortunes that had befallen the nation. With the words *לֹא סָלַחְתָּ*, Thou hast not pardoned, ver. 42, he turns to the description of the common misfortune.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

In this eminently consolatory passage, vers. 19-42, with its introduction, vers. 19-21, and conclusion, vers. 40-42, every triad of verses constitutes, as regards sense, a complete whole. The effect of similarity of construction is further heightened in vers. 25-39, by the fact that the triplets of each verse begin, not only with the same initial letter, but with the same word, or

with similar words. Thus vers. 25-27 begin with *יָהִי*, vers. 28-30 with the Imperfects *יִשָּׁב*, vers. 31-33 with *כִּי*, vers. 34-36 with *ל* before an Infinitive, and vers. 37-39 are interrogative sentences. It should also be observed that from ver. 22 the Poet no longer speaks in the first person singular. It is as if he felt the necessity, at this culmination point of the Poem, of letting the individual step back behind the sublime and universal truth which he pronounces.

III. 19-21.

19 Remembering mine affliction and my misery, the wormwood and the gall.
20, 21 My soul hath them still in remembrance, and is humble in me. This I recall to my mind, therefore have I hope.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 19.—*נִחַן*. See remarks i. 3.—*וְכִרְדָּרִי*, see i. 7. [GERLACH translates it *expulsion, exile, verstoßung*. BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, OWEN: *abasement*. HENDERSON: *persecution*. BROUGHTON: *vexation*.]—*לִינְהָ*, see ver. 15.—*רָאֵשׁ*, see ver. 5.

Ver. 20.—*אֶל־לִבִּי* *שָׁחַן* occurs, except here, only in Ps. xlv. 26; Prov. ii. 18. The root *שָׁחַן* is nowhere found.—*וְתִשִּׁיָּה*. To take *י* in the sense of *quod* (ROSENMCUELLER, VAHINGER, ENGELHARDT), is an arbitrary rendering that receives no support from the reference to Gen. xxx. 27.

Ver. 21.—The expression *הִשְׁכִּיב אֶל־לֵב*, to take something to heart, is never found in Jeremiah: see Deut. iv. 36; xxx. 1; Is. xlv. 19; xlv. 8; 1 Kings viii. 47.—*אוֹחֹלֶה*. See Jer. iv. 19. The anomalous form there found, *אוֹחֹלֶה*, is traced back to *חֹלֶה* or *חֹלֶל*, but *יָחַל* in no form occurs in Jeremiah; therefore here again a difference in the use of language is apparent. Forms of *יָחַל* occur in Lamentations only in this chapter, namely, verb forms in vers. 21, 24, noun forms in vers. 18, 26. [If Jeremiah could coin an entirely new word in his prophecies and use it only once, we might allow him to introduce into the Lamentations words already coined and familiar to him in other Scriptures, even if he confine this use to one place or one chapter.—W. H. H.]—*עַל־כֵּן* has its usual signification, therefore, for that reason.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The artistic management of the composition should be here observed. The whole preceding recital from ver. 1, constitutes a crescendo movement, which ends in ver. 18 with a shrill dissonance, enhanced by the fact that it closes with the name of Jehovah, here mentioned for the first time. But this dissonance, after ver. 21, is lost in the most agreeable harmony. The three intervening verses, 19-21, constitute the transition from discord to harmony.

Vers. 19, 20. As if shocked that so terrible a thought could come into his mind, the Poet rouses himself up and directs a cry of anguish from the depths of his heart to the Lord, that He would not forget and reject him, but would graciously remember him. [GERLACH: "The prophet is certain, that if God will only be rightly mindful of the misery poured out over him, His pity must be excited (VAH.), and this certainly is immediately expressed with assurance in ver. 20."]

Ver. 19. Remembering mine affliction and my misery, the wormwood and the gall.—Remember [so E. V., margin, all the English

versions except BLATNEY, the TARG., VULG., and SYR.] *my affliction and my wanderings* (see i. 7), *wormwood and gall!* The Poet thus represents to the Lord the most striking features of his sufferings as depicted in the preceding verses. [The repetition of the three emphatic words, in which the idea of misery is condensed, *עָנִי affliction or misery*, ver. 1, *לְעֵנָה wormwood*, ver. 15, *גַּלל gall or bitterness*, ver. 15, shows that this verse is a brief and emphatic recapitulation of the whole preceding description. But with all these in view, the Prophet rejects the thought he was tempted to indulge, as expressed in ver. 18, and “does not let go his hold on the God of his life; but is convinced that if He will only regard him, all will be well” (HENDERSON).—W. H. H.]

Many interpreters stumble at the fact that the Poet, immediately after the cry of despair in ver. 18, should again address a prayer to Jehovah. Many, therefore, (BÖTTCHER, THENIUS) take *יְכָר* and *יְכָר הַזֵּכֶר*, ver. 20, as the subject of a hypothetical proposition, *Remember my misery . . . yea, my soul remembers it and humbles itself in me.* [E. V.: *Remembering mine affliction . . . My soul hath them still in remembrance and is humbled in me.*] But to take the Inf. Constr. *יְכָר* in a finite sense, is altogether ungrammatical and without precedent. EWALD, indeed, takes *יְכָר* as an Imperative, but as an address “to the first best hearer.” He also takes *יְכָר הַזֵּכֶר*, ver. 20, for the third person feminine, *My soul, holds up before itself* [remembers with self-reproach], it humbles itself in me. It seems to me that all these interpreters exaggerate the suddenness of the transition from the cry of ver. 18 to the prayer of ver. 19, and do not rightly apprehend it. They overlook the softening effect of *וַאֲנִי*, and *I said* [i. e., to myself], and they fail to observe that the prayer immediately following in ver. 19, plainly shows that the language of ver. 18 was the expression of a rash but conquered moment of despair. Thus the Poet, by the fact that he can again pray in this way, plainly gives us to understand that his despair had secured no strong foot-hold in his breast. Some regard *יְכָר הַזֵּכֶר*, ver. 20, as the second person masculine indeed, but in the Indicative sense,—*truly thou thinkest thereon*,—indicating the hearing of the prayer uttered in ver. 19. But in that case the sentence should not be continued with the Imperfect. It should have been, *וַיִּשְׁחָה*. See my *Gr.*, § 84, n. f. [“The perfect is used to denote a fact which can only be represented as accomplished in actual reality, but which happens, as respects time, in the immediate, unconditioned future.” NAEGLSACH’S *Gr.*]

We not only regard *יְכָר* as a prayer directed to the Lord, but *יְכָר הַזֵּכֶר*, ver. 20, as an emphatic repetition of it. [Some old commentators translated *יְכָר* as the Inf., but regarded ver. 19, as in close connection with ver. 18. See MÜESTER: *Secundum quosdam est יְכָר infinit., ut sit sensus: perit spes mea, recordante me afflictionis mee* (GERLACH). The interpretation of this verse must be determined by the gender and person, or subject of *יְכָר הַזֵּכֶר* in ver. 20.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 20. **My soul hath them still in remembrance, and is humbled in me.**—*Remember, yea remember, that my soul composes itself in me.** [Lit. *Remembering Thou wilt remember, i. e., according to the familiar Hebrew idiom, Thou wilt certainly remember.* CRANMER BIB.: *Yea thou shalt remember them; for my soul melteth away in me.* OWEN: *Remembering thou wilt remember them, for bowed down within me is my soul.* NOYES: *Yea, thou wilt remember them, for my soul is bowed down within me.* GERLACH: *Remembering Thou wilt indeed remember that my soul is bowed down within me.* The last is undoubtedly most literal and exact.—W. H. H.]—After the prayer, so emphatically repeated, *Remember, Oh do Thou remember*, what immediately follows can only indicate something favorable,—*that my soul composes itself in me.* The meaning of the verb *שָׁחָה* (see also

שָׁחָה and *שָׁחָה*) can only be *sedere, desiderare, [to sit, sink or settle down]*. The Kal in Ps. xliv. 26, is evidently taken in a bad sense, “For our soul is bowed down to the dust,” *שָׁחָה לְעֶפֶר נַפְשֵׁנוּ*.

The Hiphil (for there is no apparent reason for forsaking the K’tib) is to be taken either in the indirect causative sense, denoting to *cause that something sinks, sits down*, or in direct causative sense, to *cause sinking, to sink one’s self, to sit down*. Since, according to what precedes, the Poet’s soul had been excited in the highest degree, furiously agitated (see *חֲכִיכָר*, i. 20; ii. 11), the meaning to *sink itself, sit down, become calm*, would be admirably appropriate here, and the more so because, according to what precedes, the Poet had brought reproach upon his soul, by an ebullition of feeling of an unjustifiable kind, and bordering upon defiance. It is certainly seemly for such a soul to sink down, as it were, into itself, and to become still, as the ocean returning to rest after a

furious storm. The expression *in me, עָלַי*, is used here as in Ps. xlii. 5, 6, 7, 12; xliii. 5; cxxxi. 2; cxlii. 4; Jer. viii. 18, etc. See DELITZSCH *Psych.*, IV., § 1, pp. 151, 152. There lies in it the idea of *heaviness*, as if the heart felt burdened. [WORDSWORTH: “*My soul * * * sinks down upon me.* The soul (Hebr. *nephesh*) is the seat of the agitated affections, and it sinks down, as it were, in a swoon, upon the Spirit (Hebr. *ruach*), the diviner faculty, and overwhelms it. Comp. Ps. xlii. 4-6; xliv. 25; lxxvii. 3; cxlii. 3.”—The commentators have succeeded in obscuring the meaning of this verse, by many possible or impossible translations, for which the curious may safely consult GERLACH, but the real meaning is expressed by the most natural translation of the words, *Remembering Thou wilt remember, i. e., Thou wilt surely remember, that my soul sinks within me, or is bowed down in me, or upon me* (literally, according both to NAEGLSACH and WORDSWORTH), i. e., is humbled in penitence and overwhelmed with sorrow. So GERLACH.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 21. **This I recall to my mind (margin, make to return to my heart), therefore have I**

* [WORDSWORTH mistranslates NAEGLSACH.—*Remember, remember Thou, that my soul sinks within me.* Gedenke, a gedenke, Dass meine Seele sich beruhige in mir. *Sich beruhigen* means to *quiet, compose one’s self*. Besides, his notes explain the Hebrew in the sense of sinking down into a state of rest after great agitation.—W. H. H.]

hope.—*This will I take to my heart, on this account will I hope.* The effect of the soul's becoming submissive and acquiescent is, that it now again takes to heart those facts which, notwithstanding all hardships endured at the hand of the Lord, yet always encourage the exercise of confidence in Him. **This** (חַלַּל) cannot refer to what precedes. Still less can **therefore** (עַל־כֵּן), of the second clause. For what precedes is only a prayer, with no positive promise. Ver. 21 is the immediate introduction to the impressive consolatory section which begins with ver. 22. It is shown in what follows, why the Poet still cherishes hope. See the conclusion of ver. 24, *therefore will I hope in Him.* [The awkward reference of the *this* and *therefore* of ver. 21, to what follows, which is rendered necessary by the translation of ver. 20, adopted by NÆGELSBACH and others, is a strong argument against the correctness of that translation. 1. The position of the *this*, as the first word of the sentence, strengthens the likelihood that it refers to something just stated, rather than to something about to be stated. If we explain its position in the sentence by the necessity of the proper initial letter, this may show how much the style is affected by the artificial structure of the poem, and greatly weakens the argument of those who imagine they discover differences between the style of the Lamentations, and of Jeremiah's Prophecies. But 2. The *this* and *therefore*, if they refer to what follows, lead us to expect an immediate, clear and definite proposition, to which they would logically correspond. But there is no such proposition stated, but certain general truths follow, which only remotely and by a mental process of our own minds, can be made to satisfy the requirements of the *this* and *therefore* in ver. 21. 3. The attempt to establish a connection between the *therefore I hope* in ver. 21,

and the same expression at the end of ver. 24, as if one were an index finger pointing forward, and the other an index finger pointing backward, showing that all that lies between them is the *this*, on account of which the prophet says *therefore I hope*, is open to the following objections. (a) The *therefore* of ver. 24, can only logically refer to the words immediately preceding, "Jehovah is my portion, saith my soul." (b) The *therefore*, in ver. 24, is restricted to what immediately precedes by the addition of the words "in Him." If it had been intended to correspond with and explain the declaration of ver. 21, it should have been "therefore I hope in *this*," i. e., in the doctrine contained in all the preceding verses, to which the *this* of ver. 21 refers. (c) The fact that there is as much in the verses immediately following ver. 24, as in those immediately preceding it, to afford hope and comfort, makes it exceedingly improbable that ver. 24 terminates a section begun in ver. 21. (d) If the *therefore*, of ver. 24, refers to a proposition preceding and not following it, it is likely that the *therefore* of ver. 21 does also. 4. The translation of ver. 20, as CRANMER'S BIBLE, OWEN and NOYES translate it (see above on ver. 20), or as ROSENUELLER translates it (*Enim vero reminisceris, hoc animo meo meditor*), and still more as GERLACH translates it, *Thou wilt certainly remember that my soul is bowed down in me, or upon me*, renders the meaning of ver. 21 clear and unequivocal. *This* assurance, that God is mindful of the soul that is bowed down upon itself, in sorrow and penitence, the Prophet takes to heart, and therefore hope revives in his bosom. We thus have a graceful and easy introduction to the beautiful passage that follows in which the thought expressed in ver. 20, that God is mindful of the submissive patient sufferer, is expanded and reappears at every point.—W. H. H.]

III. 22-24.

22 *It is of the LORD's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions*
 23, 24 *fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness. The LORD*
is my portion, saith my soul; therefore will I hope in him.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 22.—חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה. GERLACH argues that the use in Jer. xlv. of חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה, in ver. 18, for the first person plural, and of חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה, in vers. 12, 27, for the third person plural, is decisive evidence of the Jeremiah use of language in the Lamentations.—W. H. H.]—The plural חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה, not found in Jeremiah, is frequent elsewhere, ver. 31; Gen. xxxii. 11; Is. lxiii. 7; Ps. lxxix. 2; cvii. 43, etc.—רַחֲמֵי־יְהוָה, Jer. xvi. 5; xlii. 12.—כָּל־יּוֹם, Jer. viii. 20; xiv. 6; xvi. 4, etc.

Ver. 23.—חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה is in apposition to רַחֲמֵי־יְהוָה, Jer. xxxi. 22, 31.—לְבָקָרִים, Is. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxxiii. 14; ci. 8. Jeremiah uses לְבָקָר in this sense only once.—אֲמוֹנָה, Jer. v. 1, 3; vii. 28; ix. 2.

Ver. 24.—The expression אֲכָרָה נַפְשִׁי occurs only here.—לֵא. This construction with לֵא occurs, Ps. xxxviii. 16; xlii. 6, 12; xliii. 5; Mic. vii. 7, etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 22-24. It should be especially observed here that the passage which is full of the richest comfort and which includes vers. 22-42, con-

stitutes the middle portion both of the third chapter and of the whole book. For as chapter third occupies the middle place among the five Songs, so the two decades of verses, vers. 22-42, constitute almost exactly the middle part of chapter third. Here the author skilfully introduces

the sunshine. He permits the bright day of hope and resignation to follow the night of despair described in ver. 18. Immediately following these verses, however, the misery of the people and of the Prophet is again depicted in the gloomiest colors, so that this bright part is, as it were, framed in on both sides with deep darkness, which serves as a back-ground to make the colors of this picture of consolation stand out with greater distinctness. And so, as it were, the dome of the building, artistically constructed of these tearful Songs, rises up as a pyramid of light out of painful darkness, by which means the comforting truth, that for believers the sun of happiness will at last triumph over the night of misery and suffering, is placed conspicuously in the clearest and strongest light. First of all the joyful announcement is made, vers. 22-24, that, by the grace of God, Israel is not yet completely undone. There is still a remnant which can serve as a connecting link for the new order of things. This great favor Israel owes to the mercy of God, which is not yet exhausted, but rather in consequence of it the faithfulness of God renews itself every morning, so that the Poet can proclaim with assurance, as a noble anchor of hope and consolation, that the Lord is his portion, and that he may still say to his God "Thou art mine."

Ver. 22. **It is of the LORD'S mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not.**—*Because of Jehovah's mercies we are not consumed* [Gnaden Jehovah's sind es, dass wir nicht gar aus sind. So also, word for word, GERLACH], *for his compassion has no end.* [The E. V. is more accurate, *because his compassions fail not.*—W. H. H.] The fact that the Poet here speaks in the first person plural, when elsewhere, down to ver. 40, he speaks only of himself, is explained by what has been already shown, that he fastens the cords of his own personal hope to the fact that *the people* still exists, even if only as a weak remnant. But that even such a *kernel* remains, he ascribes to the grace of God. [See these transitions from singular to plural and back again, explained in remarks introductory to the chapter.] The use of the plural in *mercies* involves the idea of manifestations of grace, or illustrations of grace, in the way of instruction and of example. Many acts of Divine grace shown to many individuals, combine in the result. Since *the mercies* (the several acts of grace) of *Jehovah* can only be regarded as the effluence of *His compassion*, we take the second כִּי as a causative particle, "*for* His compassion has no end." The compassion of God is the ground of His graciousness, in consequence of which Israel is not entirely undone.

If we could take חֲסִדֵּי for the third person plural, as the CHALDAIC, SYRIAC and many

moderns do (EWALD, THENIUS, DELITZCH on Is. xxiii. 11), the sense of this place would be entirely clear. [We could then translate with CALVIN, *The mercies of Jehovah! surely they are not consumed.* In which OWEN, BLAYNEY and BOOTHROYD substantially agree.—W. H. H.] But, notwithstanding the fact that in Ps. lxiv. 7, חֲסִדֵּי seems even more plainly than here as if it must be taken for the third person plural [not necessarily. See J. A. ALEXANDER *in loc.*], yet OLSHAUSEN is certainly right when he shows, § 82 u, that the insertion of י as a compensation for the reduplication of the consonant, is in violation of all the established rules of Grammar. It may be that at several of those doubtful places that are referred to (Is. xxiii. 11; Lam. iii. 22; Ps. lxiv. 7; Prov. xxvi. 7; Eze. x. 16) false readings have slipped in. But here this supposition is unnecessary. Here as in Num. xvii. 28, and Jer. xlv. 18. חֲסִדֵּי is the first person plural.

Ver. 23. **They are new every morning.** [*They, i. e., the mercies of Jehovah, which are ever renewed because His compassion fails not:* for His mercies are the fruit of His compassion (see notes on ver. 22).—W. H. H.]—**Great is thy faithfulness.**—*Faithfulness* is only a form of compassionate love. It is love enduring in all circumstances. [CALVIN: "Were God to take away the promise, all the miserable would inevitably perish; for they can never lay hold on His mercy except through His word. This, then, is the reason why Scripture so often connects these two things together, even God's mercy and His faithfulness in fulfilling His promises."]

Ver. 24. Vers. 22, 23, treated only of objective facts. From these a subjective conclusion is now drawn. Since the Lord is so gracious, merciful and faithful, the Poet esteems Him as the dearest treasure of his soul, as his best portion, and the foundation of his hope. **The LORD is my portion.**—*My portion is Jehovah.* This seems to refer to Num. xviii. 20, where the Lord, having told Aaron that he should receive no hereditary portion in the land, says to him, "I am thy part [*portion*] and thine inheritance." The same expression is found in Ps. xvi. 5; lxxiii. 26; cxix. 67; cxlii. 6. See Jer. x. 16; li. 19; Dent. xxxii. 9. **Saith my soul.**—[CALVIN: "He speaks emphatically, that his *soul* had thus said . . . The unbelieving also confess that God is the fountain of all blessings, and that they ought to acquiesce in Him; but with the mouth only they confess this, while they believe nothing less. This then is the reason why the Prophet ascribes what he says to his *soul*, as though he had said, that he did not boast like hypocrites that God was his portion, but of this he had a thorough conviction."] **Therefore will I hope in him.**—See ver. 21.

III. 25-33.

25 The LORD is good unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him.
 26 It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the
 27, 28 LORD. It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth. He sitteth
 29 alone and keepeth silence, because he hath borne it upon him. He putteth his mouth
 30 in the dust, if so be there may be hope. He giveth his cheek to him that smiteth
 31 him: he is filled full with reproach. For the LORD will not cast off for ever.
 32 But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude
 33 of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 25.—Kal of קוֹחַ is not found in Jeremiah; he uses only Niphal iii. 17, and Piel viii. 15; xiii. 16; xiv. 19, 22. Kindred expressions are found in Ps. xxv. 3; lxix. 7; Is. xlix. 23.—The expression יְהוָה אֵת יְהוָה is found in Jeremiah several times and in different senses, x. 21 (?) ; xxi. 2; xxix. 13; xxxvii. 7. Yet none of these places seem to have been in the Poet's eye. If some earlier declaration was in his mind, it was apparently Deut. iv. 29, where it is said יְהוָה שֵׁנִי בְּעֵינַי.

Ver. 26.—[See *crit. notes below*.]—הִשְׁוִיעָה, Jer. iii. 23.

Ver. 27.—עָלִי. See i. 14. עָלִי occurs only here.—נְעִירִים frequently in Jeremiah, iii. 4; xxiv. 25, etc.

Ver. 28.—נָטַל, not in Jeremiah. It occurs, besides here, only in 2 Sam. xxiv. 12; Is. lxiii. 9. נָטַל, Is. xl. 15, is probably from נָטַל, to turn aside (see DELITZSCH at this place), of which verb Jeremiah makes frequent use, xvi. 13; xxii. 26, 28.

Ver. 29.—[This verse is wanting in the Sept.]—אֵילִי Jeremiah uses often, xxi. 2; xxvi. 3, 7; li. 8. [CALVIN: "The particle אֵילִי expresses what is difficult; for when anything appears to be incredible, the Hebrews say, *If it may be*."]—The phrase יֵשׁ הַקּוֹחַ is found not only in Prov. xix. 18, but also in Jer. xxxi. 17.

Ver. 30.—Neither the Part. בָּכָה, nor לָחֵץ, see i. 2, occurs in Jeremiah: נָתַח לָחֵץ is found in Is. i. 6.—The expression שָׁבַע בְּחָרָפָה occurs only here, yet there is a similar construction [of שָׁבַע with ב, instead of Acc.] in Ps. lxxv. 5; lxxxviii. 4. The words שָׁבַע and חָרָפָה, by themselves, are current in Jeremiah; see for the first, xxxi. 14; xli. 10; i. 10, for the other vi. 10; xv. 15; xx. 8; xxiv. 9, etc.

Ver. 31.—Jeremiah never uses נָחַץ, see ver. 17; ii. 7.

Ver. 32.—הוֹנָה, see i. 4; v. 12.—רָחַם, often in Jeremiah, xii. 15; xxxi. 20; xlii. 12, etc.—כָּרַב חֲסָדָיו is found, pointed thus, Ps. cvi. 45, besides Is. lxiii. 7.—With regard to grammatical construction, see ver. 22.

Ver. 33.—The verb עָנָה, *inclīnatum, depressum esse* (Piel again in Lam. v. 11) Jeremiah uses in no form.—כָּלֵבָן, see Deut. xvi. 28.—יָנָה is Imperf. Piel of יָנַח, the Hiph. of which we have in ver. 32. This form occurs only here: it is shortened from יָנַחַה, as יָרַד, ver. 53, from יָרַדַּה. See OLSH., p. 547.—בִּנְיָ אִישׁ, not found in Jeremiah; he says only once אִישׁ בִּנְיָ, xxxii. 19. [If he could use this latter phrase "only once," he was not so addicted to it that he could not use the other "only once."—W. H. H.] The phrase, besides here, is found only in Ps. iv. 3; xlix. 3; lxii. 10. At the last two places אִישׁ בִּנְיָ occurs in the immediate context.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 25-33. The thought underlying this section is,—the Lord has kind purposes towards the children of men in all circumstances; even if He chastises them, He does it for their good; men should so deport themselves in misfortune that they may ensure the attainment of the Lord's wholesome intention. Then will He permit His mercy to return again. [Here we plainly see the expansion of the assertion made in ver. 20, that the Lord will be mindful of the soul bowed down upon itself in submissive sorrow.—W. H. H.]—The three verses, 25-27, begin with the same word טוֹב, good, and evidently belong together, as in this section generally the connection of verses beginning with the same initial is very apparent. Thus in the three following triads, vers. 28-30, 31-33, 34-36, the verses begin not

only with the same letter, but with homogeneous words.

Ver. 25. The LORD is good—*Good is Jehovah—unto them that wait for him,—to them who trust in Him.* [Wait, waiting in hope, is the correct idea.—W. H. H.],—to the soul that seeketh him.—The idea of טוֹב=good, is presented to us in three aspects in vers. 25-27. Here we have the fundamental idea, that the Lord Himself is good. This belongs to His nature. He is good even when He causes pain. Man though in trouble, perceiving the goodness of the Lord, cannot defiantly murmur or faint-heartedly despair. He must rather hope even in Him who slays him, seek even Him who seems to thrust him away from Himself.

Ver. 26. It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the LORD.—*Happy is he who keeping silence waits for the salvation of Jehovah.* [The

Hebrew construction is difficult. The authorities differ on important points. But all the translations result in the same essential meaning, which is, on the whole, as well expressed in our common English version, as in any. *It is good both hopefully and silently, i. e., uncomplainingly, submissively, to wait for the salvation of Jehovah.*—W. H. H.] From the proposition that the Lord is good to those who wait for Him and seek Him, follows necessarily this other, that the man is fortunate, even in the midst of chastisement, who patiently and silently hopes for the salvation of the Lord. Thence it appears that טוב, *good*, here is to be taken in the sense of *felix, happy, fortunate*, which it undoubtedly has in iv. 9; Jer. xlv. 17; Is. iii. 10; Ps. cxli. 5.

[טוב.] The attempt has been made to take this word in verses 26, 27 as a repetition of the statement in ver. 25, that *Jehovah is good*. Thus NEUMANN (see GERLACH), *Good is Jehovah to those who hope in Him . . . Good—and who waits . . . Good to the man, etc.* This creates a very harsh ellipsis in ver. 26, and reduces the meaning in ver. 27, down to this, that Jehovah is good to that man only who bears the yoke in his youth. BLAYNEY and BOOTHROYD avoid these two difficulties, by translating קוּ in ver. 25 as a singular noun (which OWEN claims as the correct reading on the authority of the *Syr.*), and by introducing an illative particle (*therefore, hence*) in ver. 26, that is not in the Hebrew. BLAYNEY: *Jehovah is gracious unto him that waiteth for Him . . . He is gracious, therefore let him wait . . . He is gracious unto a man, etc.* BOOTHROYD: *Jehovah is good to him that waiteth for Him . . . He is good, hence let him hope, etc.* Besides the grammatical difficulties above stated, these two translations, by making an independent proposition of ver. 27, teaches the wretched doctrine that God is necessarily *gracious* or *good* to a man who is afflicted in his youth. They are, too, open to the grammatical objection that GERLACH brings against NEUMANN's translation, that it would require the *suffix* at the end of verse 26, instead of the name *Jehovah*. The repetition of the word טוב in these verses should, doubtless, be regarded merely as a sort of initial rhyme, intended to please the ear and the eye, and to fix the attention.—W. H. H.]—If טוב is taken in the sense of *felix*, the following יחיל explains itself. It is insufferably harsh to take this as Imperf. Hiph. as many do. EWALD refers to this, § 235 a. The examples adduced by him in that place, afford no analogy to the case before us. Why should not טוב here be construed precisely as it is immediately afterwards in ver. 27? The double ! is easily explained, if we take יחיל as a verbal adjective from יחל, as GESENIUS (*Thes*, p. 590. comp. 327), WINER, FUEST and others do, although this adjective does not occur elsewhere. An objection to this may be urged from דוּקם, which is only found besides here in Is. xlvii. 5, and Hab. ii. 19, where it has an adverbial signification. But the question is, whether דוּקם is a pure adverb, or not rather an original adjective noun (see אילם, a *forefront, porch*).

EWALD affirms the latter, § 204 b. Comp. § 163 g. In this original adjective signification may דוּקם stand here. MAURER, indeed, proposes to take יחיל and דוּקם substantively, *bonum est expectare et silere; propr., expectatio et silentium=tacita expectatio*. He refers in this connection to

רביל. But, as EWALD shows, § 153 a, this formation occurs even where it has an abstract sense, as רביל *obtretractio*, כליל *totality*, yet there is always a passive idea beneath it, as, for example, *retributio* originally *retribution, disposition* originally *the being disposed*. So also רביל was originally *obtrectatum*, כליל *consummatum*. According to this יחיל would be *expectatum*. But this sense does not suit here. The connection requires the pure abstract idea of *expectatio*. Therefore we take יחיל and דוּקם in the adjective sense, and the double ! for *as well as, as also, or both—and*. [*Both hopeful and silent or submissive.*]

Ver. 27. *It is good—Good is it—for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth.*—If that one is happy, who silently waits and endures, then it follows that sorrow itself has its good side: for it begets that silent endurance. It is the hot fire that ripens that noble fruit. Therefore in the next place the Poet calls bearing the yoke something good. He adds, it is true, *in his youth*. This seems to have caused the interpreters difficulty, even in old times. The Aldine edition of the Sept., and thereupon THEODORON, translated ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ, *from his youth*. And in fact many Codices read בְּיָעוּתוֹ, *from his youth*. But the idea of *youth* is not to be taken in too restricted a sense. By it the Poet would indicate evidently, not youth in opposition to manhood, but the period of still fresh unbroken strength, in opposition to the period of broken and diminished vitality. He would then understand manhood as included in youth. He would not exclude the thought that it may be wholesome, in a certain sense, for the old to bear the yoke. He means only that the time of vigorous strength is especially the time when bearing the yoke may be of advantage. For then a man is pre-eminent pliable. Then can he learn, in the school of the cross, things that will be of the greatest use to him in his later life. [CALVIN understands the yoke as that of instruction, instead of chastisement; submission to the teacher. So the Chaldee paraphrases explain it. But the whole context requires us to understand the yoke of affliction and submission to Divine Providence. See especially the following verses, 28-33.—W. H. H.]

J. D. MICHAELIS has concluded from this verse, that Jeremiah wrote it when a young man. It seems to me that there is some truth at the foundation of this remark. In this third chapter the *person* of the speaker stands out in the foreground. In the connection of this chapter, then, this expression can certainly be better understood in the mouth of a man in the vigor of his strength, than in the mouth of an old man. Since then Jeremiah, at the time of the capture

of Jerusalem, stood at the very least on the threshold of old age, having a ministry of forty-two years behind him, which he had begun rather after, than before, or at his twentieth year (see *Introduction to Jer. Proph.*, p. xiii.), therefore this place is rather against than for Jeremiah's authorship of this Song. [Is it natural for a young man to talk about patiently and silently bearing a yoke? Is it not natural for an old man, looking back upon a long experience, to recognize the benefit of early crosses and afflictions? Could we imagine anything more likely to be said by the pious Prophet in his old age, than what is here said? And is it not just what his personal sufferings that begun in his youth long before Jerusalem was destroyed, would have led him to say? And, finally, do we not recognize everywhere in these Lamentations, the spirit of one who has been long a stranger to happiness, who,—unlike the young man, strong, sanguine and self-reliant,—has lost all hope save a hope in God, looking far onwards into the hidden future, that is to be waited for in silent passive, submission?—WORDSWORTH: “The sentiment before us is very appropriate to Jeremiah, who had been chastened in early life by God, and had thus learnt a lesson of patience and cheerful resignation under the severest personal afflictions; and he here recognizes the benefit of that early discipline.”—W. H. H.]

Ver. 28. **He sitteth alone and keepeth silent.**—The bearing of the yoke is not unconditionally wholesome for a man, but only when it is done in the right way. That is no right and wholesome way of bearing the cross, when one is impatient and perverse, and desires to shake off the yoke. Rather, the yoke should be borne in silent and patient submission.—The *sitting alone* is in opposition to cheerful intercourse with men. This Jeremiah himself makes explicitly conspicuous, when he says, xv. 17, “I sat not in the assembly of the joyful [E. V., *the mockers*], nor rejoiced; I sat alone, because of Thy hand: for Thou hast filled me with indignation.” Only in silence and solitude do Divine chastisements affect the heart. Whoever permits himself to be diverted by the noise of the world, drowns the voice of God, which speaks to our heart by means of the yoke. Compare, besides, i. 1; Lev. xiii. 46.—*And is silent*: comp. ii. 10, 18; Jer. xlvii. 6; xlviii. 2.—**Because he hath borne it upon him,**—when [because] *He imposed it on him.* The old translators (SEPT., JEROME, SYRIAC) have taken the verb in the sense of *taking upon one's self* [so E. V., CALVIN and OWEN], because they thought, the subject being wanting, the subject of the immediately preceding verbs must be supplied. But the Hebrew verb (שָׁטַל) as also (טָלוּ) means *tollere, imponere* [to lay upon, to impose]. The whole context readily supplies Jehovah as the subject, and the word itself gives the object. [BROUGHTON, HENDERSON, NOYES and GERLACH, all agree with NAEGELSBACH, in taking the verb in an active sense, and in making God the subject of the verb,—because, or when *He laid it upon him.* CALVIN, evidently dissatisfied with his own rendering, confesses that the expression does not seem natural to him, and suggests another reading. NOYES remarks that

“the name of God is understood, as often in Job,” and refers to his note on Job iii. 20.—W. H. H.]

[LUTHER, PAREAU, DE WETTE, MAURER, THENIUS and NOYES, make vers. 28-30 dependent on ב, that, in verse 27, and expository of the meaning of bearing the yoke. *It is good that a man bear the yoke in his youth, that he sit alone and is silent, etc., that he put his mouth in the dust, etc., that he give his cheek to him that smiteth him, etc.* This gives a good sense; but the emphatic idea in ver. 27, is,—not that a man bear the yoke, but that he bear it in his youth; it is hardly possible, therefore, that vers. 28-30 can be an expansion of ver. 27, without showing why it is good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth. We are compelled, therefore, to interpret vers. 28-30, independently of ver. 27.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 29. **He putteth his mouth in the dust.**—This expression is found only here. It is different from the expression *lick the dust* (Ps. lxxii. 9; Mic. vii. 17; Is. xlix. 23). For whilst the latter denotes only the lowest degree of subjection, the former denotes likewise speechlessness, since he who has put his mouth in the dust cannot speak. Yet it is not meant that he who is humbled in the dust cannot say anything at all. Only he shall restrain himself from murmuring. Ejaculations of humble imploring prayer may be extorted from the heart. As such an ejaculation we must regard the words—**if so be there may be hope,**—perhaps *there is hope.* For if we take these as the words of the Poet, then we cannot understand why they occur just here. They would in that case stand as well or better at the end of ver. 30, in place of *he is filled full with reproach.* Here at the close of ver. 29, they are only in place, if they can be brought into organic union with the first member of the verse. This is done if we take them as what the humbled one is permitted to say, or rather to think, in spite of his putting his mouth in the dust. I do not on this account think, that we should supply לֵאמֹר, *saying*, for it would illy suit to say—he becomes dumb speaking. We must, therefore, understand the sentence, as indeed a declaration of the humbled one, but as an independent exclamation, not grammatically connected with the preceding sentence.

Ver. 30. If the three propositions, vers. 28-30, be compared one with another, a certain gradation will be perceived. For sitting alone and silent is comparatively easy. To put the mouth in the dust and yet to hope, is more difficult. But the hardest of all, without question, is to present the cheek to the smiter and patiently accept the full measure of disgrace that is to come upon us.—**He giveth—offers—his cheek to him that smiteth him.**—By *him that smiteth him* we are not to understand, exclusively and immediately, God. For God smites not immediately, but by the instrumentality of men. “The Lord hath bidden him,” said David in reference to the revilings of Shimei (2 Sam. xvi. 11). For the sense, see Job xvi. 10; Matt. v. 39. [CALVIN: “There are many who submit to God when they perceive His hand; as, for instance, when any one is afflicted with a disease, he knows that it is a chastisement that proceeds from God;

when pestilence happens, or famine, from the inclemency of the weather, the hand of God appears to them; and many then conduct themselves in a suitable manner: but when an enemy meets one, and when injured, he instantly says, 'I have now nothing to do with God, but that wicked enemy treats me disgracefully.' It is then for this reason that the Prophet shows that the patience of the godly ought to extend to injuries of this kind."—**He is filled full with reproach.**—[CALVIN: "There are two kinds of injuries; for the wicked either treat us with violence, or assail us with reproaches; and reproach is the bitterest of all things, and inflicts a most grievous wound on all ingenuous minds."]

Vers. 31-33. The triad now following states the reason why it is good not to despair in trouble, but to persevere in silent hope. The reason is contained in three specifications; or, more correctly, in two, the second of which is shown in two particulars.

Ver. 31. The first reason is a negative one. **For the Lord [Adonai, not Jehovah. Yet see Intr., Add. Rem., p. 32.] will not cast off for ever.**—The same expression as Ps. lxxvii. 8; comp. xlv. 24; lxxiv. 1. CALVIN: "It is certain there will be no patience, except there be hope . . . As patience cherishes hope, so hope is the foundation of patience; and hence consolation is, ac-

cording to Paul, connected with patience; Rom. xv. 4."]

Ver. 32. The second reason contains two particulars. The first is a positive one: the compassion of God after He has a long time smitten, will yet appear again. **But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies.**—*For if He has afflicted, then is He moved to compassion according to His great mercy.* With regard to the meaning, see Hos. vi. 1, Job v. 18; Ps. xxx. 6 (5). [See also Is. liv. 7, 8; Ps. lxxxix. 32-34.]

Ver. 33. The second particular of the second reason is expressed in a negative form: God must, after He has smitten, have compassion again, because chastisement is not with Him an end, but a means. The essential disposition of His heart is love. Therefore chastisement is not the proper or true expression of His feeling towards us. **For he doth not afflict willingly** [marg., *from his heart*], **nor grieve—yet He grieves** [and grieve.—W. H. H.] **the children of men.**—*From the heart:* Not out of His heart, but if we may be allowed to speak of God anthropopathically, chastisement comes from His heart. The antithesis indicated here is not expressed in the context [*willingly*, see Num. xvi. 28]. For the sense, see Ps. cxix. 75; Jer. xxxii. 41; Deut. xxviii. 63.

III. 34-39.

34, 35 To crush under his feet all the prisoners of the earth. To turn aside the
36 right of a man before the face of the Most High. To subvert a man in his cause,
37 the Lord approveth not. Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass, when the
38 Lord commandeth it not? Out of the mouth of the Most High proceedeth not
39 evil and good? Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment
of his sins?

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Vers. 34-36.—The three infinitives which begin these verses, can only depend on רָאָה. But רָאָה in connection with אָל or עַל has the meaning of *intueri in aliquid*, fixing the eyes on something (Is. xvii. 7; Ex. v. 21). Owing to the affinity between אָל, עַל and לְ (See Ew., § 217, c, d, i), לְ רָאָה can be used for אָל רָאָה. So Ps. lxiv. 6, and here [GERLACH refers also to 1 Sam. xvi. 7]. The necessity of choosing a word beginning with לְ, on account of the alphabetical arrangement, has here at any rate decidedly prevailed. [NEUMANN, according to GERLACH, makes these infinitives dependent on לָא of ver. 33, God does not willingly allow all that Israel suffers; but this involves great difficulty in interpreting last clauses of vers. 35, 36.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 34.—דָּבַק does not occur in the Kal, Jeremiah uses it once in the Pual, xlv. 10.—The suffix in רָגַלְיוֹ (the peculiar opinion of ORTO, who takes it as synonymous with "לִפְנֵי, we dismiss), can only be referred to the subject concealed in דָּבַק. Use the Participle instead of the Infinitive, and the reference is instantly plain.—אָכִיר Jeremiah never uses.

Ver. 35.—The phrase הָטָה כִּשְׁפֹתַי never occurs in Jeremiah. [Yet he was most familiar with it, especially in his favorite book of Deuteronomy.—W. H. H.] He uses הָטָה many times in another sense, v. 25; vi. 12; vii. 24, etc.—כִּשְׁפֹת—נָבֵר, comp. אֲבִינִים, Jer. v. 28.—עֲלִיֹן as a name of God, not in Jeremiah; he uses the word only twice, in a local sense xx. 2; xxxvi. 10. [See Intr., Add. Rem. p. 32.]

Ver. 36.—עֵינַי, only Fiel, Pual and Hithp., occur. The word does not occur at all in Jeremiah. In Lamentations the substantive עֵינַה, ver. 59, is also found.—רִיב, Jer. xv. 10; xxv. 31, etc.—The construction אָדָם בְּרִיבֹנִי seems to be chosen to vary the phrase from ver. 35; for elsewhere we find only עֵינַי כִּשְׁפֹתַי (Job viii. 3; xxxiv. 12), צָרָק (Job viii. 3), or דָּרָךְ (Ps. cxlvi. 9).

Ver. 37.—[וְהָיָה.] NAEGELSBACH in his *Grammar* refers to a similar use of 3d Pers. Fem. Sing. of verb in Jud. x. 9; 1 Sam. xxx. 6, וְהָיָה לִי; Jer. vii. 31; xix. 5, וְהָיָה עַל-לִבִּי; Jer. xlv. 21, וְהָיָה עַל-לִבִּי; and Josh. xi. 20; 2 Kings xxv. 3, הָיָה. The last two examples show that OWEN is wrong when he says that this verb is "probably always masculine, when it has this meaning," and should, therefore, be taken here as second person masculine.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 38.—I do not think that ver. 38 depends on אָכַר in ver. 37, as LUTHER translates, *Who then may say, that such a thing is done without the Lord's command, and that neither evil nor good comes out of the mouth of the Most High?* For אָכַר in ver. 37 is not merely *to say*, but it involves here the abstract idea of *command*, which does not need an object following after it, in order to define it. But ver. 38 must be taken independently as a question. See Exeg. notes below on ver. 36.—רָאָה, Jer. xiv. 9.

Ver. 39.—חִי אָרָם reminds us of the grammatical construction of חִי אֵל, Ps. xlii. 3; lxxiv. 3; 2 Kings xix. 4, 16. Jeremiah uses the adjective חִי only in the formula of an oath, חִי; or, חִי אֵל, iv. 2; v. 2; xii. 16, etc.: in xxxviii. 2, it seems to be a verb,—see at that place.—חָטָא, see i. 8; Jeremiah uses neither in the singular nor in the plural.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 34-39. We have already, at ver. 30, discriminated between an indirect and an immediate chastisement. It is there left undecided, which may be intended. But this point remaining uncertain must now be made plain. All the grounds of consolation, brought together in what precedes, must be acknowledged as valid and substantial. But they apply only to such sorrows as those of which God is esteemed the immediate author. But how is it with those sorrows which the malice of men inflict upon us? The opinion might arise, that these evils befall us without the intervention of God, and that He takes no notice of them. Yet these evils are very numerous; and what consolation can be afforded against these evils from what is said in vers. 25-33, to those who are suffering under the hand of God? To this question it is now explicitly answered, in vers. 37, 38, that nothing in the world is done without God's will, that no man has the power to act with absolute creative independence, that both good and bad fortune depend on the will of the Lord. Consequently there is no reason for sighing despairingly over any calamity, whatever it may be. There is no absolute misfortune—except sin! All sorrow of the heart then concentrates itself on the source of evil, on wickedness.

Ver. 34. **To crush—to trample—under his feet.**—The pronoun *his* must refer to the subject of the infinitive to crush. [OWEN absurdly refers it to *man* in the last verse, where the last words literally are *children of man*.—W. H. H.] **All the prisoners of the earth.**—This cannot mean literally all the prisoners on the whole earth. This is evident from the use of the verb to see (רָאָה), ver. 36, in the perfect tense. The Poet can only have in his eye real, concrete circumstances. Only those prisoners can be intended, already spoken of above, i. 3, 5, 18. אֶרֶץ, earth, [improperly translated *land*, by BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD and HENDERSON] is not against this; see Ps. xlv. 4; xxxvii. 3. DELITZSCH at this place, GESEN. *Thes.*, p. 154. [BLAYNEY's arguments that the *prisoners* intended are those held and enslaved for debt, could satisfy no one but himself.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 35. **To turn aside the right of a man—to bend the right of a man** [i. e., to deprive a man of his legal rights.—W. H. H.]. See Ex. xxiii. 6; Deut. xvi. 19; xxiv. 17; xxvii. 19; 1 Sam. viii. 3; comp. Prov. xvii. 23; xviii. 5; Is. x. 2.—**Before the face of the Most High.**—The author thinks here of the omnipresent and omniscient God, who enthroned on high looks far down on Heaven and earth (Is. cxiii. 5, 6).

[BLAYNEY translates עָלֵינוּ (*the Most High*) here a *superior*: asserting that it cannot refer to God, because no one can wrest judgment where HE is the Judge. The meaning evidently is, however, to pervert judgment at earthly tribunals, though this is done, as it were, *before the very face of the Most High*, who sees all things and is present everywhere.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 36. **Tosubvert.**—The word means to bend, to bend down, and is used both in reference to persons (Job xix. 6; Ps. cxix. 78; Eccl. vii. 13), and things (Am. viii. 5; Job viii. 3, etc.). **A man in his cause—in his law-suit. The Lord approveth** (marg., *seeth*) **not.** *Has not the Lord seen that?* In this sentence the signification of the verb and the form of the proposition are doubtful. As regards the meaning of the verb רָאָה, I do not believe it can be taken in the sense of *choosing, preferring* (see Gen. xli. 33; Deut. xii. 13; 2 Sam. xxiv. 13); or in a sense derived from that meaning, *agreeing to, allowing* (EWALD). For where רָאָה has the meaning of *choosing*, there are always a number of objects placed before the sight, among which the subject, after looking round by way of examination, makes his choice. But it cannot be said that where God permits the injustice done by men, He has positively chosen it. [The learned and sagacious commentator, in the heat of his argument, has made a singular blunder. The proposition is not *necessarily* a question, involving an affirmative answer, but may be a direct affirmation, that God does not approve, choose, or look with favor on such injustice (לֹא רָאָה).—W. H. H.] Further, this sense would not suit the construction of the infinitive with

לֹא depending on רָאָה (see Gram. note, vers. 34-36, above). We are obliged then to take this verb in its natural, original sense of *seeing*. But in that case it is clear that the proposition must be taken as a question, as in verse 38. For it were a contradiction to say, the perverting of the right *before the face of the Most High, the Lord does not see*. What is done before the face of the Lord, He cannot fail to see. This is the very basis of the argument. If there were anything which the Lord doth not see, we might allow that that particular thing was done without His consent. But since He sees everything, then must everything that is done, be done with His consent. The absence of the interrogation is no more remarkable than at ver. 38. See for example Job ii. 10, my *Gr.*, § 107, 1. The perfect form of the verb, רָאָה, shows that the Poet had here especially in mind the oppression that had befallen Israel and the Prophet. He would say, Must not the Lord have seen all the misery which the Israelites had suffered as captives, or by the

injustice of the mighty, all the misery especially which had extorted from the Poet the foregoing lamentation? If he had had in his eye, not the concrete and actual, but merely general and possible facts, he would, without doubt, have used **רָאָה**, as BÖTTCHER has remarked. See below **רָאָה**, ver. 38. [The English version, *the Lord approveth not*; or as BROUGHTON has it, *the Lord liketh not*, is undoubtedly correct, and is adopted by BLAYNEY (who translates the verb *seeth not*, but explains it in the sense of *not approving*), BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON and WORDSWORTH. It avoids the harsh and arbitrary explanation of supposing vers. 34-36, the language of an objector, who affirms *the Lord doth not regard* these acts of oppression and injustice, as CALVIN and OWEN suggest. It also avoids the equally arbitrary assumption of NAEGLSACH, GERLACH and NOYES, that these words are put interrogatively. There is nothing in the form or context to suggest a question. Ver. 38 is no parallel to this case: for there the question is suggested by the question that precedes and the question that follows it: the whole triplet is in the interrogative style. It is dangerous to allow the right to assume an interrogation for the sake of surmounting a difficulty. Were this license generally accepted, the Bible could be made to teach the very reverse of what it does teach, by assuming that its positive affirmations, are interrogations emphasizing the contradiction of what is apparently asserted. The opinion that **רָאָה** means *to view with pleasure, preference or approbation*, only when followed by the preposition **בְּ**, has been so generally accepted, that Dr. J. A. ALEXANDER hesitated to give **רָאָה** followed by **לְ** that meaning in Is. liii. 2. Yet only that meaning suits that passage: and in 1 Sam. xvi. 7, we have **רָאָה** with **לְ** twice in this exact meaning of *regarding with pleasure, with favor, with approbation*,—"man looketh on the outward appearance, but Jehovah looketh on the heart." It will be found on examination of those passages where **רָאָה** is construed with **בְּ**, that the preposition intensifies the sense and seems to denote *looking steadfastly at a thing, feasting the eyes upon it with inward delight, or with exultation as over a prostrate foe*. But **רָאָה** without **בְּ**, is also used to express the idea of *looking at a thing with indulgence and allowance*, where no special complacency is implied. It is thus used here, and in exactly the same sense that it has in Hab. i. 13, "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil," **בְּקִרְיֹת רָעָה**. WORDSWORTH: "The sense is,—For a man to crush under his feet all the captives of the earth (as the Chaldeans crushed indiscriminately their Hebrew captives, without regard to sex or age), to pervert a man's cause in the face of the Most High, to subvert a man in his cause—*this* the Lord does not look on with approval. For He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity."—W. H. H.]

Ver. 37. **Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass, when the Lord commandeth it not?**—*Who is he that spoke and it was done, unless the Lord commanded it?* [NOYES: "Who is he that can command anything to be done, so that it shall be effected, unless Jehovah

permit or order it to be done?"] This verse affords the proof that the evils, enumerated in vers. 34-36, had not befallen those who suffered them, without God's consent. This verse reminds us that there is only one single absolute creative causality; for the words **אָמַר וַיְהִי** [*He said—and there was*] do, without doubt, refer to the creative-word (Gen. i. 3, etc.). Were there a man of whom it could be said,—*He spake and it was done, He commanded and it stood fast* (Ps. xxxiii. 9), then it might be possible that those evils had befallen Israel at *his* command, and not Jehovah's. Evidently the Poet has in mind these words just quoted from Ps. xxxiii. 9, although he quotes from memory as appears from the substitution of **וַיְהִי** for **וַיֹּאמֶר**. But see the *femin* in such cases, my *Gr.*, § 60, 6 b [see *Gram. note above*]. The second clause of ver. 37 is evidently suggested by the second clause of Ps. xxxiii. 9, only it is changed into a negative sentence, which serves likewise to define the implied negative of the first clause. There are some, indeed, in reference to whom the expression **אָמַר וַיְהִי** [*he spoke and it came to pass*] might in a certain sense be used, but only when the Lord has also commanded what is done. There is no one whose will is efficient without the consent and command of the Lord. The explanation, *Who then may say, that such a thing is done without the Lord's command?* (LUTHER, ROSENUELLER and others), is ungrammatical. It ignores the Imperfect with *Waw* consecut. [The thought is the same as in Amos iii. 6, *Shall there be evil in a city, and the LORD hath not done it?*—OWEN gives an entirely new version. *Who is he who says, That Thou art Lord who dost not command?* This is on the assumption that vers. 34-38 contain the sentiments of an objector, whose argument now is, in vers. 37, 38, "that God as a Lord or Sovereign does not command or order events, and for this reason, because both evil and good cannot come from Him." This interpretation, harsh, difficult and against authority, could only be accepted in case **לֹא רָאָה**, ver. 36, must mean *does not see, regard or observe*, and not *does not approve*, (see notes, ver. 36). and also in case **וַיְהִי** in this verse, must be rendered as 2d person masculine, and not 3d person feminine (see *Gram. note above*).—The connection of this triplet with the preceding one, according to Dr. NAEGLSACH's interpretation of ver. 36,—*has not the Lord seen that?*—is very obvious. But it is no objection to the other interpretation—the Lord does not approve, that these three verses recognize God's agency in the evils that befall men. It is the problem constantly recurring in the Bible, that God does not approve of oppression and injustice, and yet God makes sin the punishment of sin. No one can sinfully injure his neighbor with God's approbation: and yet the injury he does is God's providential chastisement of transgressors.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 38. **Out of the mouth of the Most High proceedeth not evil and good?**—*Goes not out of the mouth of the Most High the evil and the good?* If there is no one who is able to make his will efficient without God's permission, then follows necessarily the general proposition, that

everything, as well evil as good, proceeds from the mouth of God, *i. e.*, is done by God's command. It certainly is not the Poet's intention here to suggest any reflections on the origin of moral evil. He has in his eye, according to the whole context, only the contrast of prosperity and adversity. By *the evil* he means physical evil or misfortune, and by *the good*—physical good or happiness. And although misfortune is frequently a consequence of moral evil, according to vers. 34-36, yet he regards this consequence only with reference to its bearing on human welfare, and not with reference to its causation. What he wishes to say is, that the Lord permits wrong and violence, as well as those actions that tend to promote happiness, in order, according as His purpose may be, to chastise or to bless. But he did not intend to say that God had positively willed what is evil, although the signification of evil is not exhausted in the idea of chastisement.

Ver. 39. Since happiness and misfortune are both equally willed of God, both must be good, and nothing belonging to either of them should cause us to murmur. As a man who has brought upon himself wholesome sickness by means of bitter medicine, ought not to complain of that medicine, but should blame himself for having caused the necessity of using it, so a man should not complain of the evils which befall him, for these are only the necessary means of curing the sickness of sin, of which he himself is guilty. If he will lament, let him lament for his sin. See Jer. xxx. 15.—**Wherefore doth a living man complain** (marg., *murmur*).—*For what sighs the man who lives?* The verb, **הִתְאָוֵן**, is *respirare*, *gemere*, to sigh with the kindred idea of *murmuring*, Num. xi. 1. which is the only place except this, where the word occurs. The expression *a living man*, **אִרְם**, is difficult. It cannot be taken, with PAREAU and ROSENUELLER, as synonymous with **אָדָם**, *a man*, in which case **אִרְם**, *living*, would be, properly speaking, superfluous. Neither can it be taken for **חַיָּה**, *vita, life*, in which case the sense would be *cur queritur homo vitam scil. calamitosam* (MAURER) [why complains man of life, *i. e.*, because it is calamitous]? As little can it be called *as long as he lives* (J. D. MICHAELIS); or, *although he lives*, since he yet lives and could do something better than sigh (EWALD). The only sense corresponding to the context is, *what does the man as a living one sigh for?* *As a living one, i. e.*, as one who still finds himself in this life's school of discipline. How should we in the time appointed for affliction mourn over our afflictions? A living man should not allow himself to be surprised by "the fiery trial" as if thereby some strange thing happened unto him (1 Peter iv. 12): only that happens to him which is natural and inevitable. **A man for the punishment of his sins?**—*Every one on account of his sins.* This can only be the answer to the question proposed in the first member of the verse, designed to rectify the evil in view, —not sufferings, but sins should be lamented.

[The difficulties of this verse are great, as is evident from the variety of translations and interpretations it has suffered. Four questions are to be answered. 1. The meaning of the verb

rendered *complain* or *murmur*? 2. The force of **אִרְם**, *living*? 3. The sense in which *a man*, **אָדָם**, of the second member of the verse is to be taken? 4. Whether the whole verse composes one question, or includes a question and a responsive exhortation or a question and a simple answer?—1. The meaning of the verb **הִתְאָוֵן**? ABEN EZRA derived it from **אָוַן**, and rendered it by **שָׁקַר**, to *lie* (see CALVIN, FURST, GERLACH). Hence MÜNSTER, taking ver. 38 as a denial of Divine Providence, explains ver. 39 thus: *blasphemia hæc vox est 'mentiturque homo in peccatis suis.'*—this is a blasphemous saying 'and man is a liar in his sins' (GERLACH). ISAAKI derived the verb from **אָוַן** (FURST). From this root possibly, by some far-fetched analogy, BROUGHTON brought his unique translation, which has the sole merit of relieving us of the difficulty of explaining *a living man*, **אִרְם**, and *a man*, **אָדָם**, by making one the subject, and the other the object of the verb,—*what should living man grudge any person after his sin?* But what this means the learned Hebraist has not explained. CALVIN is very positive that the word here and in Numbers, means to *weary one's self*. "Why should he weary himself, *a living man*, and *a man in his sins*? for as long as men thus remain in their own dregs, they will never acknowledge God as the judge of the world, and thus they always go astray through their own perverse imaginations." Others render it in a similar sense: "Why doth he afflict himself by his sins? Why doth he procure evils to himself by the committing of sin?"—"Why doth he vex himself? (to wit, by impatient carriage under God's hand), even a man in his sin, persisting still in the same" (see GATAKER). The Versions and Lexicographers, however, with great unanimity, and apparent reason, derive the verb from **אָוַן**, to *breathe hard*, to *sigh*, and take it in the sense of *murmuring, complaining*, as above. There is no room to doubt that this is its meaning. 2. What is the force of **אִרְם**. PAREAU and ROSENUELLER, deny that this word is emphatic. They claim that **אִרְם**, alone, is used for *man*, referring to Ps. cxliii. 2, and regard **אָדָם**, added here, as a mere redundancy of language by Jeremiah, who was not chary of words, *verborum non parcior*. We are then to take the expression *living man*, as meaning simply *a man*, as we often say *living man*, or *mortal man* where the adjective is superfluous: (ROSENUELLER translates the text simply *mortalis*.) To this we answer 1. The word **אִרְם** in Ps. cxliii. 2, is emphatic:—None living, *i. e.*, no *living* man is just, or innocent in God's sight. The inference may be allowed, possibly intended, that those not *now living* may have passed into a state of innocency in God's sight. 2. The position of the word after **אָדָם** (reminding us, as NÆGELSACH says, of **אָל**, see gram. note above) and also the accent it bears* show that the word is emphatic. In this case it is difficult to assign any other

*OWEN, in utter violation of the accents, connects **אִרְם** with **אָדָם**, and translates,

Why complain should man,
Any man alive, for his sin?

meaning to it, than that which EWALD and most commentators do, *why sighs man living, i. e., since he lives*. Dr. NAEGELSBACH says it cannot have this meaning: but he gives no reason why it cannot: and his own translation involves this sense, (*what does a man sigh for who lives, der lebt?*) while his explanation in the commentary, *man as a living one (als ein Lebender)*, "i. e., as one who still finds himself in this life's school of discipline," adds to the original, and what he calls impossible idea, of *one who yet lives*, another and fanciful notion of his own. MICHAELIS, EWALD, GERLACH, BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON and NOYES, all agree in the sense which our English Version seems to suggest, which WORDSWORTH also adopts and explains thus: "Wherefore does a man, whose life is still spared by God's mercy, and to whom, therefore, the door of repentance and pardon is not yet closed, *murmur* (see Num. xi. 1, where the same word, literally signifying to *breathe hard*, is used), instead of using his breath and life in order to pray for forgiveness, and to amend his practice?"

3. In what sense are we to take נִנְּר, a man, in the second member of the verse? While אָדָם is the generic name for man in the widest sense, נִנְּר is supposed to be a more distinctive and honorable designation, as implying a man possessed of manly qualities. Some suppose that it is used emphatically here in this sense, as BLAYNEY suggests. Since most languages have a variety of words signifying man, most of the Versions render אָדָם of the first member, and נִנְּר of the second, by terms of corresponding significance, as if intending to express an emphasis in the last term,—*ἀνθρώπος, ἀνὴρ; homo, vir; Mensch, Mann*,—a distinction that seems to be aimed at in English in a version given by GATAKER, *Why should a living wight complain, or murmur, any man for his sin?* This distinction, if intended, would give a good sense, *Why should a living man, a truly manly man murmur at the punishment of his sins?* The Arabic gives the following sense: *He who dissolves himself in lamentations and sighs, is a weak man; the strong man is ashamed of his sins (Prediger-Bible)*. CORN. VAN WAENEN, according to ROSENMUELLER, inferred from the Arabic that נִנְּר has the sense of being affected with shame, and joining it to נִנְּר in spite of the strong disjunctive accent, translated thus: *Why does the mean man (homo vilis) dissolve himself in lamentations? The noble man (vir nobilis) will restrain himself for shame on account of his crimes*. But there are no proofs or analogies for this strongly contrasted use of אָדָם and נִנְּר. We can, however, take נִנְּר here, as Dr. NAEGELSBACH does, in a sense that אָדָם often has, of *every one*, each man individually considered. See Joel ii. 8; Jer. xvii. 5, 7; Jos. vii. 14, 17, 18; 1 Chron. xxiii. 3. There are many other passages where the word may be rendered *every man* or *every one*. GESSENIUS gives it this meaning in our text. This rendering prevents the necessity of breaking up the verse into two separate and distinct members. 4. Does the whole verse include a single question? Many versions take the first member as a question, and the second

as a responsive exhortation. So the old Geneva, which NOYES adopts: *Wherefore then murmureth the living man? Let him murmur at his own sins!* GERLACH's objections to this are well taken. The antithesis would then require that in the question some cause of murmuring should be stated, which the prophet would indicate as an improper one; as, 'Wherefore murmureth living man on account of his misfortunes? Let him murmur on account of his sins.' It may be said that the cause may easily be inferred from the context. Still it would seem strange that such an important antithesis was not distinctly expressed. Besides, this rendering makes it necessary, not only to repeat the verb contained in the first member and not expressed in the second, but to change it from the Indicative mood to the Imperative, *why does he murmur, let him murmur*. These difficulties are overcome by taking the verse as a question and a simple answer, not expressed in a hortatory form. So Dr. NAEGELSBACH: *Why does the man who lives mourn? Every one on account of his sins*. So MAURER, quoted by GERLACH, *quid i. e., cur queritur homo dum vivit? Unusquisque ob peccata sua. Hinc ille lacrymæ! Peccatis sibi quisque contraxit de quibus queritur mala*. "Why does man mourn whilst he lives? Every one on account of his sins. Hence those tears! By his sins each one has brought on himself the evils he complains of." A great objection to dividing this verse into question and answer is, that it mars the rhythmical parallelism which is a peculiar feature of this poem [see *Intr., Add. Rem.*, p. 23], and quite destroys the remarkable and beautiful symmetry between the several verses of each triplet, which prevails in this part of the poem. For the same reason that each verse in this triplet should be a question, if one is, each verse ought to contain a question and an answer, if one does,—or else each verse should form an entire question by itself. Besides, the connection seems to require such a construction. The declarations that God does not inflict evil willingly, *from His heart*, that He does not look with favor on oppression and injustice, and yet that nothing comes to pass without His permission, whether it be evil or good, prepares us for the question, *Why then does man murmur when he suffers in the righteous Providence of God for his sins? Why should living man—man whose life is mercifully spared—complain or murmur, every one on account of his sins, i. e., of the effects of his sins?* The idea of dividing the sentence into a question and response arose, undoubtedly, from the difficulty of taking נִנְּר in the usual sense of a man. But by rendering it *every one*, and remembering that אָדָם is generic, like *homo, ἀνθρώπος, Mensch*, and can be best expressed in English by *men*, as even in German LUTHER rendered it, *Wie murren denn die Leute im Leben* also? the apparent difficulty of construction entirely disappears. *Why should living men complain or murmur, every one on account of his sins?* There can be no valid objection to understanding *sins* as put for their effects, the sufferings or punishment they involve. So most of the versions and interpreters. Or we can take *sin* in the sense of guilt, liability to punishment. WORDSWORTH: "Literally, *for his sins—for his own*

fault. Why does the sinner murmur at God for that which he has brought on himself by his own sin, and which may be removed by repentance?

See what follows."—The Future form of the verb implies here a conditional sense, *why should, etc.* —W. H. H.]

III. 40-42.

40 Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the LORD. Let us lift
41 up our heart with our hands unto God in the heavens. We have transgressed
42 and have rebelled: thou hast not pardoned.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 40.—פָּשׁוּ, *perforare, pervestigare*, is not found in Jeremiah. See Ps. lxi. 7; Prov. ii. 4; xx. 27.—חָקַר, *fodere, eruere, perscrutari*, occurs in Jer. xvii. 10; xxxi. 37.—[GERLACH: "The LXX have taken the forms נִחְפְּשׁוּ and נִחְקְרוּ for fem. part. niph."—רַע is emphatic, EWALD, § 217, e. *let us go back, not half way, but the whole.* [ROSENMUELLER and THENIUS deny that it is emphatic, and represent it as equivalent to אֵל. GERLACH agrees with NÄGELSACH, and refers to Hos. xiv. 2, 3, where both prepositions stand side by side with a difference of meaning not to be mistaken.]

Ver. 41.—אֶל is cumulative, as Lev. xviii. 18; Ez. xlv. 7. [Also Ez. vii. 26. The unusual use of this preposition led the Rabbins to fanciful interpretations of the text. Some have put upon it the mystical sense, *lift up our heart to our hands*, in order to second prayer with practice, (GATAKER).—W. H. H.]—לִבְּךָ נִשְׁאָר occurs only here. אֶל בְּשִׁמְךָ occurs not in Jer. See Deut. iii. 24; 1 Kings viii. 23.

Ver. 42.—נִחְנֶנֶּה, only occurs six times in the Old Testament, viz., besides here, Gen. xlii. 11; Ex. xvi. 7, 8; Num. xxxii. 33; 2 Sam. xvii. 12, seems to be chosen here only for the sake of the acrostic. [Very likely; yet, as a master of art, the Poet has made the necessity of the choice subserve the force and beauty of thought and expression. נִחְנֶנֶּה and אָרַה, both expressed, are emphatic and antithetical.—W. H. H.]—פָּשַׁע in Jer. ii. 8, 29; iii. 13, etc.—כָּרַה, See i. 18, 20; Jer. iv. 17, v. 23.—סָלַח, frequently in Jer. v. 1, 7; xxxi. 34, etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 39 constitutes the transition to something new. If there must be sighing, let it be sighing over sin says ver. 39. This exhortation is responded to in vers. 40-42, for these contain a penitential lamentation of the people for their sins. This shows that our explanation of the last member of ver. 39 is right. For, unless חָטָא, *sin*, be taken in the entirely inadmissible sense of *punishment* (MEIER, EWALD), [E. V. See notes on ver. 39], that second member of ver. 39 cannot be taken as a continuation of the question, but only in the sense of an affirmatory restriction, as we have done. It is to be observed, moreover, that the Poet here again speaks in the first person plural. We have shown above, at ver. 22 (הִנֵּנִי), that the consoling hope, declared in the passage beginning with ver. 22, rests directly upon the fact that *the people* is not extinct, that there is yet a kernel remaining which can serve as a point of connection for the restoration. After the Poet, on the ground of this matter of fact, which he regarded as a pledge for the continuance of Divine grace, had made known his hope, and declared likewise his convictions that sufferings were no real misfortune, and that not on their account, but for sin, should men sigh, it is entirely natural that he utters the penitential lamentation, enjoined in ver. 39, not in his own name alone, but in that of the whole people. For the sufferings, of which he had before spoken, were not in fact punishments for *his sins*; but they were the righteous chastisement of the sin of the whole people. The whole

people then has to join in the penitential lamentation, which the Poet begins to sing in ver. 40.

Ver. 40. All true penitence must begin with acknowledgment of sin. But the knowledge of sin with men is the result of candid self-examination. Therefore, the penitential lamentation of the people begins with an exhortation to self-examination. **Let us search and try our ways.** *Let us examine our ways and search.* [Instead of murmuring against God, let us examine and search our conduct for the causes of God's displeasure and our misfortunes, in order to correct them.—W. H. H.]—**And turn again to the LORD.**—*And return to Jehovah.* The preposition in the Hebrew is forcible. [See Gram. note above]. Let us go, not half way back, but all the way back to Jehovah. Such a half-way return was, for example, the Reformation under Josiah; see Jer. iv. 1-4, and the remarks at that place. This idea of returning to Jehovah, as is well known, plays a very conspicuous role in Jeremiah; see iii. 1, 4, 12; viii. 4, 5; xxxi. 16-22, and the comments on those passages. [HENDERSON: "From the assumption of the plural in this and the immediately following verses, it is obvious that, in those which just precede, Jeremiah has in view the punishment to which the Jews, as a people, were subjected."]

Ver. 41. **Let us lift up our heart with—*together with*—our hands unto God in the Heavens.**—Without the lifting up of heart and hands to God there is naturally no right return to God imaginable. [CALVIN: "He bids us banish all hypocrisy from our prayers. * * When affliction comes, it is a common thing with all to raise up their hands to heaven, though no

one should bid them to do so; but still their hearts remain fixed on the earth, and they come not to God. * * As prayers, when they are earnest, move the hands, our Prophet refers to that practice as useful. At the same time he teaches us that the chief thing ought not to be omitted, even to raise up the hearts to God; *Let us, then, he says, raise up our hearts together with our hands to God*; and, he adds, to God *who is in Heaven*: for it is necessary that men should rise up above the world and go out of themselves, so to speak, in order to come to God." It should not be overlooked that the Prophet connects the outward forms of expression with the heart's sincerity as constituting the prayer of true penitence. There is nothing here to encourage those to think that they pray, who discard the attitude and gestures and even words of prayer, and fancy that they pray in their hearts. That prayer is an unuttered desire, a trembling emotion of the soul, a sigh, a tear, the glancing of an eye,—are only poetical truths, and, in plain prose, are only half-truths, and, as sometimes understood, half-falsehoods. The Bible never separates the prayer of the heart from its formal expression in words and acts.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 42. The first half of the verse attains the summit of the succession of thoughts begun in ver. 40, and to which the path was broken in ver. 39.—**We have transgressed and rebelled.** [*Rebelled* is a better rendering. The pronoun *we*, doubly expressed in the original, as the first word in the sentence and in the forms of the verb, "is here emphatical, as though the faithful had taken on themselves the blame of all the evils, which the greater part ever sought to disown" (CALVIN). OWEN: "To give the proper emphasis to the pronoun, the version ought to be as follows, *We, transgressed have we, and re-*

belled."—W. H. H.]—By these words the exhortation contained in last clause of ver. 39 is complied with, for they are the expression of a deep and sincere grief for sin. The second half of the verse constitutes, in a way similar to that of the last clause of ver. 39, the transition to what follows. For the words—**Thou hast not pardoned**—constitute an intermediate member between the two statements, which have respectively for their subjects, guilt and punishment. Guilt is followed with punishment, if not pardoned. That it is not pardoned in the present instance, this last clause of the verse declares.—Observe the pronouns answering to each other, *We—Thou*. [Both doubly expressed in the Hebrew. Both, therefore, emphatic.—W. H. H.]—Hence it is evident that the Poet does not wish to reproach the Lord, but, on the contrary, to make His proceedings conspicuous. [HENDERSON: "The confession is supposed to be made while the exile still continued. There is implied a fervent hope, that now it was made, the captivity would be reversed."—The breaking up of this verse into two distinct separate propositions is not such an injury to the versification as was deprecated in ver. 39. Because we have now passed the section where the symmetrical uniformity of the verses was to be preserved: because, again, this verse is a real transition to what follows, with which it is so intimately connected that GERLACH begins the new section with ver. 40: because, again, the *We*, וְאֵנָּה, and *Thou*, אַתָּה, preserve a perfect antithesis, and give us a parallelism in sentiment as well as in rhythm and because, finally, the poetical effect of this abrupt appeal to God, like the sudden outburst at the end of i. 11, *See, O Jehovah, and consider*, justifies the departure from the stricter forms of construction.—W. H. H.]

PART III.

III. 43-66.

- VER. 43. Thou didst cover Thyself with wrath and pursue us,
Thou didst slay,—Thou didst not pity.
- VER. 44. Thou didst cover Thyself with clouds
So that no prayer could pass through.
- VER. 45. Thou madest us offscourings and refuse
In the midst of the nations.
- ▮ VER. 46. All our enemies
Gaped at us with their mouth.
- ▮ VER. 47. Terror and the pit came upon us—
Desolation and destruction.
- ▮ VER. 48. Mine eye runneth down with streams of water
For the ruin of the daughter of my people.
- ℣ VER. 49. Mine eye overfloweth unceasingly,
Without intermission,
- ℣ VER. 50. Until Jehovah from Heaven
Look down and behold.

- י VER. 51. Mine eye paineth my soul
Because of all the daughters of my city.
- ז VER. 52. They that were without cause my enemies
Hunted me down like a bird.
- ז VER. 53. They destroyed in the pit my life
And cast a stone over me.
- ז VER. 54. Waters flowed upon my head.
I said,—I am lost!
- ק VER. 55. I called upon thy name, O Jehovah,
Out of the depths of the pit.
- ק VER. 56. Thou heardest my cry—hide not Thine ear
From my prayer for relief!
- ק VER. 57. Thou drewest near on the day when I called to Thee:
Thou saidst,—Fear not!
- ך VER. 58. Thou didst espouse the causes of my soul,
Thou didst rescue my life.
- ך VER. 59. Thou, O Jehovah, hast seen the wrong done to me.
Judge Thou my cause.
- ך VER. 60. Thou hast seen all their vengeance,
All their devices against me.
- ש VER. 61. Thou hast heard their revilings, O Jehovah,
All their devices against me.
- ש VER. 62. The lips of my enemies and their thoughts
Against me, all the day long,
- ש VER. 63. Their sitting down and rising up, observe Thou;
I am their song!
- ת VER. 64. Render to them a recompence, O Jehovah,
According to the work of their hands.
- ת VER. 65. Give them blindness of heart.
Thy curse on them!
- ת VER. 66. Pursue them in wrath and exterminate them
From under the Heaven of Jehovah.

ANALYSIS.

The third part, vers. 43-66, is to be compared to the night returning again after the day. From ver. 43 to ver. 48, the Poet speaks in the first person plural. The whole people unite in describing the severe calamity suffered on account of God's wrath. From ver. 48 to the end, the Poet again speaks in the first person singular. But in the first part of this passage, in vers. 48-51, the common misfortune is still the subject of his lamentation. He begins again to speak of himself in ver. 52. He first describes, vers. 52-54, the terrible ill-treatment suffered at the hands of men, according to Jer. xxxviii. 6. Vers. 55-66 contain a prayer, so that this Song, as well as the first and second, closes with a prayer. This prayer is in three parts. Vers. 55-58, thanks for deliverance from the grave. Vers. 59-63, a statement of all the injury which his enemies had done, and were constantly doing to the Prophet. Vers. 64-66, a prayer for righteous vengeance. The symmetry of the external form, which we have observed in the middle section of the Song, is wanting here, as it is also in the first part of the Song. For according to the sense, first, five verses are connected together, vers. 43-47; then, four, vers. 48-51; then, three, vers. 52-54; finally, twelve, which are again separated into subdivisions of four, five and three verses. The articulations of the discourse no longer correspond with the triplets of verses: neither is the symmetry of the initial words carried out.

▲ *the evening twilight gradually deepens into night, so the discourse of our Poet passes over from the bright day-light of consolation, which irradiates the noble central section of our book, back again into the gloomy description of those sufferings with which Israel and the Prophet of the Lord were punished. We stand at the threshold of the last of the three sections of the third Song. If not exactly, yet almost exactly has the Poet distributed the lights and shadows, so that the first and the last of the three parts contain the shadows, and the second one affords the light. For of the 66 verses of the chapter, 22 constitute a third part. But the middle section, after the transition verses, 19-21, extends from ver. 22 to ver. 40, after which vers. 40-42 follow as another transition, corresponding to the first one as the evening twilight does to the dawning of the morning. If we add both of these transition passages to the middle section, then the first of the three sections consists of 18, the second of 24, and the last again of 24 verses.*

III. 43-47.

43 Thou hast covered with anger, and persecuted us: thou hast slain, thou hast not
44 pitied. Thou hast covered thyself with a cloud, that *our* prayer should not pass
45 through. Thou hast made us *as* the offscouring and refuse in the midst of the peo-
46, 47 ple. All our enemies have opened their mouths against us. Fear and a snare
is come upon us, desolations and destruction.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 43.—כָּכָךְ, which does not occur in Jeremiah, is used as a direct causative, as afterwards, ver. 44; See Ps. cxl. 8. [GERLACH: "GESENIUS *Thes.*, and OTTO take כָּכָךְ as a *reflective verb*." OTTO, quoted by ROSENMUELLER, says *At reciprose verbum כָּכָךְ usurpari posse, non dubium*; but he prefers here to supply *nos* as the object of the verb. To make the *pron. suf.* הַרְדִּפְנִי the object of כָּכָךְ, however, is impossible, since the latter, when it has the meaning of *covering*, is always construed with עַל, or לְ affixed to its object.—W. H. H.]. בָּאֶרְ, see Jer. xxi. 5.—[אֶל. HENDERSON: "Upwards of eighty MSS., twelve printed editions, the ALEX. copy of the LXX., the Arab., Syr., Vulg. and Targ., read אֶלָּא"]

Ver. 44.—Jeremiah uses only the plural of עָנָן, and that only once, iv. 13.—הַעֲבוֹר הַפֶּלֶא, for the construction, see my *Gr.*, § 106, 6. [The preposition כִּן is very peculiarly used as a negative. When the idea of *motion from a place* is involved, then that which is denied is connected with the verb simply by כִּן. NAEGELSBACH'S *Gr.*, § 106, 6.]

Ver. 45.—כָּחִי from כָּחַה, *detergere, everrere*, Est. xxvi. 4, is *sweepings, dirt*. It occurs only here. [In Is. v. 25 we have כְּוֹחָה, *sweeping, refuse, filth* (J. A. ALEXANDER).—W. H. H.]. כְּאוֹכֹ, as a substantive, only here. See EWALD, § 240, a.—Jeremiah expresses the thought contained in this verse in another fashion, see xv. 4; xxiv. 9; xxix. 18; xxxiv. 17; xlii. 18.—הַעֲפִיִם בְּקֶרֶב seems to imply the dispersion of Israel among the nations. בְּקֶרֶב is nowhere found in Jeremiah, he always uses instead בִּתְרוֹךְ, xii. 16; xxix. 32; xl. 1; xli. 8, etc.; once only he uses בְּקֶרֶב, vi. 1, and besides בְּקֶרֶב with suffixes frequently iv. 14; xiv. 9; xxiii. 9, etc. [Certainly then בְּקֶרֶב is not foreign to his style.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 47.—פָּחַר וּפָחַת is a quotation from Jer. xlviii. 43; Is. xxiv. 17.—הַשָּׂאת וְהַשְׁכֵּר. The paronomasia, an imitation of פָּחַר וּפָחַת, is an invention of our Poet, for it is found only here.—שָׂאת, apparently from שָׂאָה, *tumultuari, strepere*, is contracted from שָׂאָת. In Num. xxiv. 17, is found שָׂת. The meaning seems to be the same as that of שָׂאוֹן, *strepitus, tumultus*. See בְּנֵי שָׂאוֹן, Jer. xlviii. 45, and the remarks at that place. Also וְשָׁכַר, Is. lix. 7; lx. 18.—שָׁכַר, see ver. 48; ii. 11, 13; iv. 10, is very frequent with Jeremiah, iv. 20; vi. 14; viii. 11, 21, etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 43. Thou hast covered with anger, and persecuted us.—*Thou madest out of Thy wrath a veil [or covering] and didst pursue us.* As *Thou hast not pardoned*, ver. 42, constitutes a negative term of connection, so does *Thou madest a covering of Thy wrath* a positive one. For the veil of wrath with which the Lord covers Himself, conceals in its bosom the lightnings of wrath of which the Poet proceeds to speak. [The causative meaning given to the verb by Dr. NAEGELSBACH, and implied, though not affirmed by GERLACH, is certainly possible (see Ps. xci. 4, לָךְ בְּאַכְרֵתוֹ לְךָ, lit., *With his wing He will make, or provide*, J. A. ALEXANDER, a covering for thee), and is strongly recommended here by the absence of an object expressed. *He made a covering of the wrath and pursued us*, is the same as saying, He enveloped Himself in His wrath and pursued us. The definite article before *wrath, the wrath*, points to Jehovah's wrath, and makes the reflective force of the verb more apparent. In the next verse, where the *cloud* does not specify any particular cloud, but only *clouds* generically, the expression of לָךְ, for *Thyself*, is more elegant. These slight grammatical distinctions can hardly be expressed in English, in which it is best to give the same form in both verses.—The purpose of the covering is not that of concealment, but of preparation for the pursuit of His enemies. He

dismisses His pity and gathers His wrath around Him as a veil that covers the whole person, that He may slay and not pity. Or His wrath itself may be regarded as furnishing His weapons of offence, the armory out of which flash the lightnings of His wrath. Therefore the objection of J. D. MICHAELIS, BOETTCHER and THENIUS, that *he who conceals himself, does not pursue others* (although a concealed enemy may, nevertheless, be a pursuer), is not valid. We must either take the verb in a *causative* or *reflective* sense, or supply לָךְ, *Thyself*, from the next verse. This last is exceedingly awkward. If the order of the verses was reversed, this might be tolerated, though even then it is inconsistent with the usual independent completeness of each separate verse in the Lamentations. But to say "Thou didst cover with wrath"—and then hold the mind in suspense, as to the object covered, till it is announced in the next verse, is awkward to say the least, and certainly has the effect, as THENIUS asserts, of throwing all that follows the word *wrath* into a parenthesis.—Our English Version and others which make *us*, at the end of the verse, the object of the covering cannot be correct if the verb is here used in the sense of *covering* (see Gram. note above). Some old expositors, alluded to by GATAKER, take the verb in the sense of being *hedged in*. BLAYNEY and OWEN take it in this sense, and suppose an allusion to the practice of hunters, who surrounded their game with toils, and then attacked them. *Thou hast fenced in with anger*

and chased us (BLAYNEY). *Thou hast in wrath enclosed us and chased us* (OWEN). But how can there be an allusion to this practice of hunters in the next verse, where they give the verb the same meaning,—*Thou hast enclosed Thyself in a cloud* (OWEN)? HENDERSON also, without allusion to hunting however, gives the verb in both verses a similar meaning, *Thou hast shut us up in anger*,—*Thou hast shut Thyself up in a cloud*. But the Hebrew verb when followed by the preposition ל, to, prefixed to the pronoun, as it is in the next verse, certainly means covering one's self with something, as with a garment or a veil. See ver. 44, note. Hence it is best to take it in the same sense in this verse.—W. H. H.]—**Thou hast slain, thou hast not pitied.**—*Thou didst kill without mercy*. [The E. V. is more literal. Many versions have *spared*, instead of *pitied*. The latter meaning is better here, and the more usual signification of the verb when not joined to a preposition. See ii. 2, 17.—W. H. H.] See ii. 21. Here begins the enumeration of the aggressive acts of the Divine punishment, through which the wrath, as it were, spent itself. See ver. 66; i. 6; Jer. xxix. 18, etc.

Ver. 44. **Thou hast covered thyself with a cloud, that our prayer should not pass through.**—*Thou madest of the cloud a covering for Thyself that no prayer could pass through*. See at ver. 8. The twice recurring verb כִּפְּתָה, *thou coveredst*, has been differently interpreted. EWALD would take what follows the word *wrath*, in ver. 43, as a parenthesis. But these words closely connected with what precedes by 1 consecutive, contain no mere secondary thought. Others (LUTHER, TIENIUS) translate, *Thou hast covered (overwhelmed) us with wrath*. But the verb has always and only the meaning of friendly sheltering, veiling or covering: and further, in that case we would expect at least פָּחַד [instead of קָנָה, *with wrath*, instead of *with the wrath*]. But, aside from the constraint put upon the Poet by the alphabetical arrangement [inducing him to repeat the same word for the sake of the initial letter], I think that two grades or kinds of covering are indicated. The first was that, in consequence of which persecution and war came upon Israel,—the second was that, in consequence of which, God heard not the prayers addressed to Him amidst the calamity of war. In favor of this view is the twofold nature of the veils or coverings indicated. The first time it is *the wrath* with which the Lord envelops Himself. Out of this veil of wrath shoot forth the lightnings, as out of a thunder-cloud, which kindle the fire of war in Israel. The second time the veil or covering is only a gloomy, dense *cloud*, which, like a bulwark, prevents prayer from passing through. Whether the Poet here thought of the historical pillar of cloud (Ps. xcix. 7), or of an ideal one (Ps. xcvi. 2), must remain undecided. See, besides ver. 8; Ps. lv. 2, and especially Sir. xxiii. 16, 17.

Ver. 45. **Thou hast made us as the off-scouring and refuse in the midst of the people.**—*Thou didst make us off-scourings and refuse in the midst of the nations*. Since the Lord

permitted no prayer to pass through to Him, the work of destruction, spoken of in ver. 43, made unimpeded progress; the consequence of which was, that Israel, ground down to the dust, is now an object of contempt among heathen nations. [*Off-scouring, sweepings, what is swept away.*—*Refuse, what is rejected as worthless, what is thrown away.*—CALVIN: "Paul says, that he and his associates were the off-scouring (περιψύματα) of the world, 1 Cor. iv. 13. He means that they were despised as off-scourings or scrapings. * * What the Prophet had in view is not obscure; for he means that the degradation of the people was not hidden, but open to all nations, as though God had erected a theatre in Judea, and there exhibited a remarkable and an unusual example of His vengeance,"—among the nations. WORDSWORTH: "The nations, among which we Israelites are scattered. Such the Jewish nation has been for 1800 years; and such it will remain till it turn to God in Christ."—W. H. H.] See Is. xxiv. 13.

Ver. 46. Here again, in the order of the initial letters, D is followed by D, and not Y. That this was the original order of the verses and not the result of later changes, the context undeniably proves. It is, therefore, certainly incomprehensible how any one could have thought of placing the triad of vers. 46-48, after that of vers. 49-51 (MEIER) [BOOTHROYD, likewise].—**All our enemies have opened their mouths against us,**—*gaped at us with their mouth*. This verse, which contains only a more particular definition of what is meant by קָנָה [refuse, or as Dr. NAEGLSBACH translates it Schande, shame, disgrace] in ver. 45, has already occurred almost word for word, in ii. 16, which see.

Ver. 47. **Fear and a snare—terror and the pit.** A quotation from Jer. xlviii. 43; Is. xxiv. 17. [CALVIN, BROUGHTON, BLAYNEY, NOYES, NAEGLSBACH and GERLACH, all translate the second word *pit*, as it is rendered in Jeremiah and Isaiah, in the places cited above. In the latter place, Dr. J. A. ALEXANDER says, "It is a probable, though not a necessary supposition, that the terms here used are borrowed from the ancient art of hunting. פֶּחַח [*fear*] would then denote some device by which wild beasts were frightened into snares and pitfalls. It is at least a remarkable coincidence that the Romans gave the name *formido* to an apparatus used for this purpose." We may, however, take *fear* in its usual sense, without destroying the allusion to hunted wild beasts, suggested in this passage by *pit*, and in Jeremiah and Isaiah by *pit* and *snare*. He who flies for *terror* falls into the *pit*. So JARCHI, quoted by GERLACH. CALVIN: "He compares here the anxieties into which the people had been brought, to a *pitfall* and *dread*. * * The meaning is, that the people had been reduced to such straits, that there was no outlet for them; * * filled with dread, they sought refuge, but saw pitfalls on every side."—W. H. H.] **Is come upon us,**—*fell to our lot [happened to us, or came upon us], desolation and destruction—shame and hurt*. [The E. V. is better, and is adopted by most versions. See Gram. note above.—W. H. H.] In these pithy and forcible words the Poet sums up all that Israel had suffered.

III. 48-51.

48 Mine eye runneth down with rivers of water for the destruction of the daughter
49 of my people. Mine eye tricklETH down, and ceaseth not, without any intermission.
50, 51 Till the LORD look down, and behold from heaven. Mine eye affecteth mine
heart, because of all the daughters of my city.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 48.—The first clause is found in Ps. cxix. 136, almost word for word. For construction, see my *Gr.*, § 69, 2 a. [After verbs of *plenty* and *want*, the accusative denotes the more remote object (NAG. *Gr.*).—פָּלַגְךָ Jeremiah never uses. [Observe it is here the initial word, where special choice and even preference for novelty of expression would be expected.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 49.—The verb נָזַח, of which Jeremiah uses the Hiphil, once only [Jeremiah seems to have been predisposed to use words *only once*,—so new words in Lamentations need not surprise us, Jeremiah being the author.—W. H. H.], xviii. 21, occurs only in Niph., Hiph. and Hoph. Such places as 2 Sam. xiv. 14; Job xx. 28; Ps. lxxvii. 3, give it the sense of *overflowing*, as well as of *being poured out*.—וְלֹא תִרְכָּבָה reminds us of וְלֹא תִרְכָּבָה, Jer. xiv. 17.—כָּאֵין הַפְנוּת־ seems to be only another form of the same thought in Ps. lxxvii. 3, where we read the words פָּנֹה וְלֹא תִרְכָּבָה is *debilem, languidum esse, viribus defici* (Gen. xlv. 26; Hab. i. 4). Both פָּנֹה, ii. 18, and תִּפְנוּתָהּ, signify *remisso, relaxatio*. Both are אִתְּ. See ii. 18 and remarks there.

Ver. 50.—שָׁקַח (comp. σκέν-ρεσθαι, *spectare*) is *prospicere, despicere*. It occurs only in Hiph. and Niph.; is not found in Jeremiah; see Deut. xxvi. 15; Ps. xiv. 2; liii. 3; cli. 20, in all of which places the word is used with the addition of מַשְׁמִיךְ or מַכְרִים.

Ver. 51.—If we compare the Hithp. הִתְעַלֵּל, which in such places as Num. xxii. 29; Judg. xix. 25; 1 Sam. xxxi. 4; Jer. xxxviii. 19, has the sense of *satisfying one's desire by violence*; if, further, we compare the substantives עֲלִילָה, עֲלִילָה, and מַעֲשֵׂה, which denote, not merely generally *facinus, a deed*, but also especially a *bad deed* (see Deut. xxii. 14, 17; Ps. cxli. 4; Ez. xx. 43; Jer. xiv. 18; xi. 18, etc.);—there can be no doubt that the idea of *doing a harm* inheres in the Poet also. In i. 12, 22; ii. 20, where also this word occurs, this idea is made expressly apparent by other words of this sense. But we are authorized by the above citations, to take the word in this sense, without such express indication of its meaning in the context. [GERLACH: עוֹלִל with ל, to do some one an injury, occurs in i. 12, 22; ii. 20; therefore there is nothing unusual in the ל here, as EWALD says.]—BÖTTCHER would read כָּפַל בְּבוֹת עִירִי, of all the weeping of my city. But even if Piel is authorized by Jer. xxxi. 15; Ez. viii. 14;—and כָּל with the Inf., by Deut. iv. 7, yet כָּפַל would be expected [and then would be ungrammatical, as GERLACH shows]. But no change in the reading is necessary.—מִן is *causalt*, as Deut. vii. 8; Joel iv. 19; Is. liii. 5; Prov. xx. 4, etc.—עִירִי, Is. xlv. 13; 2 Sam. xix. 38.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 48-51. These four verses treat of the eye of the speaker, as the organ by means of which he manifests his pain:—for ver. 50 contains only a thought subordinated to that of ver. 49. The new succession of thoughts begins with the last member of a triad (the פ triad). Nothing like this has occurred before in this Song [where the triplets have been remarkable for their unification]. Would the Poet thus intimate that he has passed the culmination-point of his Poem, and therefore the culmination-point of its artistic structure also? It is not easy to decide. Besides, the fact that these verses are of the character of one sustained and continuous transition period, is itself an indication of artistic execution. For while in these verses the Poet himself is the speaker, yet he speaks of his own pain with reference to the public calamity [thus connecting what is here said with what precedes], whilst from ver. 52 he not only himself speaks, but he speaks of himself [so that these verses form a connecting link with what follows, and the subject gracefully passes from the public calamities to the private griefs of the speaker.—W. H. H.].

Ver. 48. Mine eye runneth down with

rivers of water.—See Ps. cxix. 136. We find the same sentiment in Jer. viii. 2; [E. V., ix. 1], ix. 17 [E. V., ix. 18], xiii. 17; xiv. 17; Lam. i. 16.—For the destruction of the daughter of my people.—See ii. 11.

Ver. 49. Mine eye tricklETH down, and ceaseth not, without any intermission.—Mine eye overflows unceasingly, without intermission. [Lit., My eye is poured out, or overflows, and ceaseth not, so as not to be (from not being) intermission. In correct English, My eye overfloweth, unceasingly without intermission. GERLACH: “intermissions, not of miseries (MICHAELIS, ROSENUELLER, see Vulg.), but so that there is no cessation, without discontinuance. See Lexicons and EWALD, § 323, a.”—W. H. H.]

Ver. 50. Till—or until—the LORD—Jehovah—look down and behold from Heaven.—As already remarked, this is a thought subordinate to that of ver. 49, which it limits, or qualifies. The Poet's tears shall flow without ceasing, not absolutely for ever, but until the Lord, by graciously regarding them, shall cause them to cease. [When God looks down and beholds, He begins to hear prayer and afford saving grace. See Ps. cii. 19, 20. HENDERSON translates, While Jehovah looketh down and beholdeth from Heaven, and remarks, “The Prophet regarded it as a great aggravation of the calamity,

that the Lord should see it all, and yet not interpose for its removal." But this is to take the Hebrew preposition עַל , in an unusual sense, and is wholly inconsistent with the constant tenor of Bible language, which represents God as averting His face from those who offend Him, and as looking only on those who are objects of His favor. Besides, here God has wrapped Himself in His *wrath*, ver. 43, and in dark impenetrable clouds, ver. 44, that He may not be moved to compassion either by the sight or the cries of the sufferers.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 51. The description passes, as it were, from without to within. In vers. 48, 49, the weeping of the Poet had been described with regard to its *extent* [its unintermitted continuance], but here the *intensity* of that weeping is made apparent from its internal effect on his soul.—**Mine eye affecteth mine heart** (marg., *my soul*)—*Mine eye paineth my soul* [or gives it pain, thut meiner Seele weh, makes my soul ache.] The eye hurts the soul, when it increases the pain of the soul, by adding thereto a physical pain. It is true that weeping is generally a relief to the sorrowful. But when weeping weakens the eye so that it smarts, then the soul, as I said, feels that as an aggravation of its own pain. See Ps. vi. 7. [CALVIN: "*Mine eye grieves my soul*. He had said, that his eye flowed down, and then, that it was like a fountain, from which many streams or rivers flowed: he now adopts another mode of speaking, that *his eye troubled or grieved his soul*." BROUGHTON: *Mine eye worketh into my soul*. BLAYNEY: *Mine eye worketh trouble to my soul*. NOYES and GERLACH take *my soul* as if it were simply a personal pronoun. *Mine eye is painful to me* (NOYES), or *pains me* (GERLACH). But to *my soul*, לְנַפְשִׁי , as the expressed object of the verb, is indubitably emphatic. So WORDSWORTH: "*Mine eye vexeth my soul* (*nephesh*), the seat of passion (see ver. 20) by the misery which it sees, and for which it weeps." See Gram. notes above.—W. H. H.].—**Because of all the daughters of my city.** It is not necessary to

change the Hebrew here, as BÖTTCHER proposes (see Gram. notes above), for i. 4, 18; ii. 10, 21, show that the Poet regarded the sad fate of the tender virgins as one of the culmination points of the general calamity. For the same reason, I do not think that by the *daughters of my city* are intended *daughter cities*. [Töchterstädte, i. e., cities dependent on Jerusalem. So EWALD. BLAYNEY too: "Probably the lesser cities and towns dependent on the metropolis are hereby intended, see Jer. xlix. 2."] The Poet nowhere else refers to such cities. Besides, it should be observed, that *daughters of my city* is in parallelism with *daughter of my people*, ver. 48. This gives a beautiful symmetry to the whole paragraph; the first and last verses, vers. 48, 51, each closes with a statement of a reason for his weeping, while the intervening verses describe the extent and character of his weeping. [The English version indicates in the margin a possible translation, which CALVIN alone has had the audacity to adopt: *Mine eye affecteth mine heart more than all the daughters of my city*. This would seem to mean, that his heart was more affected by his own grief, than by that of all the daughters of Jerusalem; or, that *his* grief affected his own heart, more than it did the daughters of his city. But CALVIN explains it as meaning, that he wept more than all the girls in Jerusalem! "As the female sex, as it is well known, are more tender and softer than men, the Prophet amplifies his lamentation by this comparison. that in weeping he exceeded all the young women of the city, so that he had almost forgotten his manhood." KALKAR takes the *daughters of the city* in the impossible sense of *incolæ urbis* (an ingenious adoption of a feminine form used for common gender), and translates *I was more vehemently affected than all the inhabitants of the city*. The simple and natural translation of the words gives such good sense and is so in harmony with the sentiments of the whole poem, as shown above, that it is astonishing what wasteful invention has been used to find out some other sense.—W. H. H.]

III. 52-54.

52, 53 Mine enemies chased me sore, like a bird, without cause. They have cut off
54 my life in the dungeon, and cast a stone upon me. Waters flowed over mine head;
then I said, I am cut off.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 52.—The verb צָוָר Jeremiah uses once, xvi. 16.— צָפֹר Jeremiah never uses. [Jeremiah often uses צֹפֵר in the collective sense for *fowl* or *birds*. In one single verse, xii. 9, he twice uses עֵיט , meaning *birds of prey, ravenous birds*. This passage in Lamentations is the only place where he has occasion to speak of a single bird pursued by the hunter. If he had ever used another word in the same sense, צָפֹר would have been chosen for this place for the sake of the *alliteration*, $\text{צָפֹר צָרָנִי בְצָפֹר}$, and also as suggesting the twittering of the helpless victim.—W. H. H.].—The expression אֵיבֵי חַנָּם occurs only here. In Ps. xxxv. 19; lxix. 5, שֹׁנְאֵי חַנָּם occurs, both times in parallelism with אֵיבֵי שֹׁקֵר . This shows that חַנָּם belongs, as an adverbial qualification, to אֵיבֵי , not to צָרָנִי .

Ver. 53.— צָכַת occurs in Kal only here. Niph. is without doubt *extingui* (Job xxiii. 17), *exarescere* (of water, Job vi. 17); Piel is *perdere*, to *destroy* (Ps. lxxxviii. 17; cxix. 139); Hiph. has the same sense (Ps. xxviii. 41; liv. 7; lxix. 5, etc.). צָכַת might indeed have an intransitive sense, to *be sunk in silence*, in *speechlessness*, that is to say, to *be destroyed*, to *per*

ish, in favor of which sense are the kindred roots *דָּם*, *דָּכַם*, *דָּכָה*, and the Dialects. [So HENDERSON: *They have made my life silent in the dungeon.*] But since in all the parallel members of the paragraph, vers. 52-54, the enemies are the subject, it is necessary to regard them as the subject of *צָכְתִּי* also, and to take this word in a transitive sense. *צָכְתִּי* signifies *destroy*, *בָּבֹר* can signify *in the pit*, or *into the pit*. In the latter case it would be *constr. prægnaus*. This would be more correct, because it better answers to the fact. For the enemies did not succeed in destroying the life of the prophet in the pit, but casting it down into the pit for the purpose of destruction.—*וַיִּרְדּוּ* with reference to the form, see *וַיִּרְדּוּ*, ver. 33 [GREEN'S *Gr.*, § 150, 2.]

Ver. 54.—*נָזַר* is *manare, fluere*. Kal occurs only here. Elsewhere the Hiphil at two places, Dent. xi. 4; 2 Kings vi. 6. [The use of Kal may indicate that the word here denotes, not as in Hiphil, *dashing over, overwhelming*, but, like *וָזַק* and *וָזַק*, to *melt, dissolve, flow, trickle down*. This sense is favored by the preposition *עַל*, *to, on, not over*.—W. H. H.]—*אֶכְרָתִי*, see *אָכַר*, ver. 18.—*נִנְרָתִי*. *נָזַר* is *dissecare, discindere*. Jeremiah never uses it. Niph., besides here, in Ia. lii. 8; Ps. lxxxviii. 6; Ez. xxxvii. 11, etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 52-54. The speaker here returns to the description of his own personal sufferings. The central point of these sufferings is *the pit*, into which the Prophet has been thrown, and that by enemies who were personally hostile to him without cause (ver. 52), and who pursued him incessantly (ver. 52) with vindictiveness and mockery (vers. 60-63). Ought we to interpret all that is said of the pit as merely figurative? So far as what is said of the pit alone, this could be done. But what the Poet says of his enemies, cannot possibly be a mere figure of speech. When he mourns that though he had given them no cause for hatred, they had, nevertheless, incessantly insulted him and pursued him with measureless vengeance,—this surely is no figurative way of speaking. We have already shown that the subject who speaks in this song (except in those parts in which the Poet speaks in the first person plural) cannot be the people. The enemies, further, cannot be the Chaldeans, because they are called *those that are my enemies without cause*, and because the Poet speaks of his being already delivered from their power and now only invokes [not deliverance from them but] the vengeance of God upon them (vers. 55-66). On the other hand, Jeremiah speaks of his enemies, xx. 7-12, exactly as is done here. He describes their insulting mockery (*For I heard the defaming of many*) and their vindictiveness (*we shall take our revenge on him*, *וְנִקְחָהּ בְּנִקְבָּתוֹ*, ver. 10, comp. Lam. iii. 60), and hopes that God will avenge him upon them (*let me see thy vengeance on them*, ver. 12). Since the description of his enemies in this place exactly corresponds with that which Jeremiah gives of his enemies, all of which is confirmed by so many facts related in his prophetic book (xi. 18-20; xii. 1-6; xxvi. 8; xxxvii. 11-15; xxxviii. 4-6), can we doubt that what is said of the pit should be taken literally, especially if we consider the fact that what is here said agrees substantially with what Jeremiah says, chap. xxxviii., of the pit into which he was actually thrown by his enemies? We are sure, therefore, that the Poet here had in his eye the persecutions which Jeremiah suffered from his enemies. He personates Jeremiah. The chief subject of the third song is Jeremiah.

Ver. 52. **My enemies chased me sore, like a bird, without cause.**—*Hunted, hunted have they me like a bird, all mine enemies without cause. Like a bird*: see Ps. xi. 1, where the soul of the persecuted innocent is likewise compared

to a bird. [*They that were without cause mine enemies hunted me down like a bird.* So BLAYNEY and NOYES render the verb *צָדַר*, which seems to mean, not to *hunt*, in the abstract sense, but to *obtain by hunting, to seize, to lay hold of*, and as used here in an intensive sense, would imply persevering and successful hunting. DOUAY: *My enemies have chased me and caught me like a bird.* *Hunted me down like a bird* expresses the idea suggested by the comparison.—As even a bird is at last tired out and *hunted down* by a persevering pursuer. The point of the comparison is the perseverance of the successful hunter in pursuit of a bird: as David says of Saul's tireless and remorseless pursuit of him, "The King of Israel is come out to seek a flea, as when one doth hunt a partridge in the mountains" (1 Sam. xxvi. 20). This idea is expressed in the Paris ed., 1805, of the French, *Ceux qui sont mes ennemis sans cause m'ont poursuivi à outrance, comme on poursuit un oiseau*. The French of MARTIN gives the same sense. The commentators generally fail to explain the comparison. CALVIN, who supposes the lack of "both prudence and courage" in birds is referred to, is evidently wrong, both as to the fact that birds are thus deficient, and as to its application here. Both GESNIUS and FUERST explain the verb, *צָדַר*, as used here, in the sense of *laying snares as for a bird*. This gives a good sense, and carries out the comparison; but it is adopted by none of the versions, and seems inconsistent with the general use of the verb and the intensive meaning suggested by the duplication.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 53. **They have cut off my life in the dungeon.**—*They destroyed in the pit my life* [i. e., sought to destroy it. See Gram. notes above. From Jer. xxxviii. 4, it is certain that their object in throwing him into the pit was to kill him.—W. H. H.]—**And cast a stone upon me,**—*and threw stones upon me*. But should we translate *they threw stones upon me*, or *they cast a stone over me* [i. e., over the mouth of the pit]? Jer. xxxviii. says nothing of either the one or the other. Yet it is possible that Jeremiah, whose statements in that chapter were confined, with admirable reserve, to the principal circumstances, might have omitted this point. And it is also possible that the author of our song, in case he were not Jeremiah himself, may have added this particular, either from hearsay, or out of his own invention. [The addition of a new fact affords a strong presumption that Jeremiah wrote this book. One personating him would have adhered to facts well authenticated in his history.—W. H. H.] Grammatically con-

sidered there is nothing in either the verb or the noun decisive in favor of the one or the other explanation. The verb הָרָה , which is used in Joel iv. 3, Ob. 11; Nah. iii. 10 of casting the lot, and in Jer. i. 14 of shooting an arrow, Zechariah uses also of throwing down iron [?] horns (ii. 4; E. V. i. 21). The word only occurs in the places cited. But if Zechariah uses the word of throwing down objects of such size and weight, then it could properly be used also of throwing a heavy stone over the opening of the pit. The noun, אֲבָנִים , further, can as well signify collectively a number of stones as one stone, for it frequently has that meaning after אֲבָנִים , Lev. xx. 2, 27; xxiv. 23; Josh. vii. 25; 1 Kings xii. 18 (אֲבָנִים בְּאֵרִי), comp. Num. xiv. 10, xv. 35; Deut. xxi. 21. But the preposition, עָלַי , upon me, favors the explanation *they cast stones on me*. For the difference between עָלַי and עָלַי is, that the former, as FUEST says, denotes "decided vicinity," or "such motion as is connected with the attainment of its object," whilst by the latter is expressed "motion toward without nearness." *They threw a stone on me*, that is to say, *over me* on the mouth of the pit, would be expressed by עָלַי . [Though there is a foundation for this distinction between these two prepositions, yet they are often used indiscriminately, without affecting the sense, as for instance with the verbs הָרָה , וָהָרָה , וָהָרָה , too, is used in the general sense of *over*, as with הָרָה , in the sense of ruling over, or having the management of affairs, see Ps. ciii. 19; Gen. xxiv. 2; xlv. 8, 26; Deut. xv. 6; Judges viii. 22; Josh. xii. 5; 1 Kings v. 1. If the use of עָלַי here in the sense indicated by E. V. is not absolutely forbidden, it is certainly to be preferred. 1. It would have been a wondrous outrage to throw stones upon the Prophet after he was cast into the pit. 2. It seems incredible that Jeremiah should not in his narrative of the affair have mentioned such a remarkable incident, if it had occurred. 3. They could only have thrown the stones for the purpose of killing him, and how then had he escaped death? 4. The fact that the pit was covered over with a stone, to prevent his possible escape, was a most likely occurrence, and yet one that, because likely and even to be presumed, might have been passed

over without special mention. Finally, all the versions, except NÆGELSBACH's and GERLACH's, render it as in E. V.; GATAKER indicates both senses without deciding in favor of either.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 54. **Waters flowed over my head.**—*Waters dashed (surged) over my head*. This cannot be meant of the flowing together of the water in a physical sense, over his head. For in Jer. xxxviii. 6, it is expressly said that there was no water in the pit, only mud. Besides, the flowing together of water over his head must inevitably have had for its speedy consequence the death of him who was thrown into the pit. Either the words mean merely, *water ran on my head*; or, what is more likely, this way of speaking should be understood as metaphorical, as also in Ps. lxi. 3 (2), 15 (14), 16 (15), he who is sunk in the mire, speaks at the same time of being drowned by the water-flood. That he intends this as an image descriptive of the greatest peril of death (see Ps. xviii. 17 (16); xxxii. 6; xlii. 7); lxxxviii. 17 (16), 18 (17); cxxx. 1; cxliv. 7), is evident also from Ps. lxi. 2 (1), where *for the waters are come in even to my soul* can only be taken in a figurative sense. [In Ps. lxi. all is figurative. But here, where all the rest is literal, to take one term alone as figurative, is unnatural. It would be better, with HENDERSON, to take the whole description as figurative, and as having no direct allusion to the account given in Jer. xxxviii. 6-12. But this is not necessary. The words may only mean *Water ran on my head*. See Gram. notes above. If there was mud in the bottom of the pit, there was a supply of water in some quantities from some source. The mere condensation of the vapor in the atmosphere against the sides of the pit, would produce some, and there may have been from small springs supply enough to trickle down and splash upon his head. The language, if suggested by any Psalm, was more likely that of xl. 3 (2), than of the lxi.—and brought me up from a pit of noise, and from the miry clay,—where the noise referred to seems to be that of running water. The Prophet, sinking in the mud beneath, and reminded by the water falling on his head that he was in danger of drowning, might well exclaim *I am lost*, *I am already as good as gone!*—W. H. H.]—Then I said, I am cut off,—I said, I am cut off. NOYES: *I am undone*. GERLACH: *I am lost*. Comp. Ps. lxxxviii. 5.]

III. 55-66.

55, 56 I called upon thy name, O LORD, out of the low dungeon. Thou hast heard 57 my voice; hide not thine ear at my breathing, at my cry. Thou drewest near 58 in the day that I called upon thee: thou saidst, Fear not. O Lord, thou hast 59 pleaded the causes of my soul; thou hast redeemed my life. O LORD, thou hast 60 seen my wrong; judge thou my cause. Thou hast seen all their vengeance, and 61 all their imaginations against me. Thou hast heard their reproach, O LORD, 62 and all their imaginations against me. The lips of those that rose up against 63 me, and their device against me all the day. Behold their sitting down, and 64 their rising up; I am their music. Render unto them a recompence, O LORD,

65 according to the work of their hands. Give them sorrow of heart, thy curse
66 unto them. Persecute and destroy them in anger from under the heavens of the
LORD.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 55.—**קָרָא שָׁם**. This expression does not occur in Jer.; he uses only once **קָרָא בְשֵׁם**, x. 25. [There is not enough difference in the two expressions to afford the shadow of an argument for or against the authorship of Lamentations, even if the latter expression had been frequent with Jeremiah; but as in fact it only occurs once, who can say which of the two expressions was characteristic of his style?—W. H. H.] **כְּבוֹד הַתְּהִיּוֹת**. Ps. lxxxvii. 7. **כְּבוֹד הָי**. Elsewhere occur only the expressions **גִּלְתָּ הָי**, Jos. xv. 19, and **אֶרֶץ הָי**, Ez. xxvi. 20; xxxii. 18, 24 [in each case in close connection with **בּוֹר**—W. H. H.], **הָי אֶרֶץ**, Is. xlv. 23; Ps. lxiii. 10; cxxxix. 15. **תְּהִיּוֹת** is to be regarded as related to **בּוֹר** in the genitive, not in the accusative sense.

Ver. 56. The verb עָלַם Jeremiah uses in no form. The expression עָלַם אֵין occurs only here.—[HENDERSON: "Before לְרוּחִי, the preposition has the signification of *with a view to*; before לְשׁוֹנִי, it takes its temporal signification, *at, at the time of*."]—שׁוֹנֵה, once in Jer., viii. 19; see ver. 8; Ps. xxxiv. 16.

Ver. 57. קרבֿ Jeremiah uses only once in the Hiphil, xxx. 21.—The Perfects, אָמַרְתָּ, קָרַבְתָּ, of this verse and רָבַבְתָּ, ver. 58, stand parallel to the Perfect שָׁמַעְתָּ ver. 56. They contain the specifications of that general declaration. They are therefore to be translated in the Perfect, not in the Present. אָקְרַבֿ does not conflict with this, as THENIUS thinks, for the Imperfect stands here to represent the repetition of the act in times past. See my *Gr.* § 87, f.

Ver. 58. The expression יָבִי רַבִּי is found in Jeremiah twice, i. 34; li. 36. Yet Jeremiah never uses the plural רִבִּים, which occurs, besides here, only in Ps. xviii. 44 (2 Sam. xxiii. 44). [The singular here would be inappropriate, if the meaning of the phrase is that God intended to deliver him from all the causes which endangered his life, see ver. 53.—וַיִּפֶּשׁ is not merely a circumlocution for the suffix, my, (NOYES), but רַבִּי וַיִּפֶּשׁ are *causæ quæ vitam ac salutem meam concernunt* (GERLACH), *dangerous transactions* (FUERST's *Lex.*)—W. H. H.]—Jeremiah uses only the Part. יִפְּטֹל וַיִּצָּל, and that only once, i. 34. See elsewhere, Ps. lxxix. 19; ciii. 4; cxix. 154.

VER. 60. Instead of לְ several Codd. have עַל, which corresponds better with the way in which Jeremiah expresses himself in xi. 19; xviii. 18; but is apparently only a correction suggested by ver. 61. See besides at לְדָבַר, ver. 34. [HENDERSON: "For לְ twenty-three MSS., originally thirteen more, now two, the LXX., Targ., Syr., Vulg., and Venet. Greek, read עַל as in ver. 61; where, on the other hand, seventeen MSS. read לְ for עַל."]

Ver. 61. חִפָּהּ is used here in an active sense, as in Jer. li. 51; Job xvi. 10; Zeph. ii. 8, etc.—[The difference between עָלַי of this verse, and לִי of ver. 60, according to OWEN, “is occasioned by the verbs *Thou hast seen* and *Thou hast heard*. God had seen the thoughts or purposes effected *against* him; and He had heard the purposes formed *concerning* him. He refers first to the purposes carried into effect, and then, as it is common in the prophets, he refers to the purposes previously formed respecting him.” This difference of meaning in the two verses is, however, entirely due to the verbs, and not at all to the prepositions, which would even better express the ideas OWEN attaches to them if their positions were reversed,—*have seen their devices* executed עָלַי *upon me, and heard their devices* devised לִי *with reference to me.*—W. H. H.]

Ver. 62.—(This verse may be dependent on שְׁמִיעָה ver. 61, GERLACH and most of the translators; or on הִשְׁמִיעָה ver. 63, THIENIUS, NÄGELSBACH. To supply the substantive verb הָיָה, *sunt*, before עָלַי, as ROSENUELLER suggests, is altogether unnecessary and inelegant.—W. H. H.].—קָמִים, for *enemies*, is found in Jeremiah only in the expression לֹב קָמִי, li. 1.—הִנֵּנִי is not found in Jeremiah; [nor anywhere else except Ps. ix. 17; xix. 15; xcii. 4. It is an unusual word on which no theory of authorship can be rested.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 63. קִיְיָה־ is found only here. הַיִּטָּה־, see i. 11. מִן־הַיִּטָּה־ is ἀπ. λέγου. [GERLACH: "The opinion of BOETTCHER deserves at least some consideration, that here as in Mal. i. 13, there lies concealed in the מִן־הַיִּטָּה־ (*quam, quale, what a* Saitenspiel [*derivative song*] *I am to them*). But this is not in accordance with the punctuation and receives support from none of the versions except the Syr. See Ps. lxxxix. 48."]

Ver. 64.—**הַשִּׁיב נָמוּד** is found in Ps. xxviii. 4; xciv. 2; Joel iv. 4, 7; Ob. 15; Prov. xii. 14. In Jeremiah occurs only **שָׁלֵם נָמוּד**, li. 6. **כַּמְעֶשֶׂה יְדִיהֶם** is found in Jer. xxv. 14 (a place critically suspicious), Ps. xxviii. 4.

Ver. 65.—כִּנְדָה is *ḥ. λεγομαι*. [BROUGHTON translates it *a bursting of heart*, following CHALDEUS, תְּכִירִית לִבָּא, *confratio cordis*. BLAYNEY derives the word from Piel of כָּנָן, *to deliver or make over*; “*a delivery of the heart*, that is, a

willing one, to which the heart consents;" and translates, omitting the first לֶחֶם on the authority of the ancient versions and one MS., and making a single member of the verse in defiance of accents and analogy, *Thou wilt give with a hearty accordance Thy curse unto them.* SEPT. ὑπερπατίσμον, *covering*; VULG. *scutum*; SYR. *sorrow*.—W. H. H.]. תְּהַלֵּה, from הָלַל, *a curse*, is אֶפ. λέγῶν. [SEPT. and VULG. seem to have read לִהְיוֹת from לָאָה. For construction see Ps. iii. 9. בִּרְבָּהּ עַל-עַמּוֹ super populo tuo sit benedictio tua. ROSENUELLER, GERLACH.—W. H. H.].

Ver. 66.—תִּרְדֹּךְ וְנָגַח. See i. 6; Isa. xiv. 6; Jer. xxi. 15.—Of the root שָׁמַד Jeremiah uses only the Niphal, xlvi. 8, 42.—The expression שָׁמַיִם is found only here.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 55-66. These twelve closing verses contain a prayer, so that ch. iii., like chs. i. and ii., ends with a prayer. This prayer is divided into three parts. In the first part, vers. 55-58, the speaker thanks the Lord for his deliverance from the pit. In the second part, vers. 59-63, he reminds the Lord of all that his (the speaker's) enemies had done and were still doing to him. In the third part, vers. 64-66, he prays the Lord to avenge upon his enemies the evil they had done to him.

Ver. 55. **I called upon thy name, O LORD**—*Jehovah*. The speaker begins by recalling the prayer which he had addressed to the Lord out of the pit. HITZIG is of the opinion that we have this prayer in Ps. lxi. DELITZSCH also concedes that there is much to favor this opinion; see his Bible Commentary on the Psalms, 1867, p. 438. [The caption of this Psalm ascribes it to David. There is no internal evidence sufficient to set this aside and to prove that the Psalm was written by Jeremiah or some one else "during the captivity at Babylon." Its appropriateness to Jeremiah when in the pit, is only a proof of the singular adaptation of the inspired psalms to the wants of God's children in all varieties of emergencies and circumstances. That Jeremiah repeated this Psalm when in the pit, is most likely. That it was present to his mind when writing these Lamentations is rendered probable by many suggestive thoughts and sentiments.—GERLACH and NOYES translate the verbs, from ver. 55 to the end, in the present tense. This makes the translation in some respects smoother and the sense in some places more apparent. But the references are to deliverances past, pointing hopefully, amidst present and unrelieved afflictions, to deliverances yet in the future. For this reason alone, the preterite sense of the verbs should be retained, even if the difficulties of translation were greater than they really are.—W. H. H.].—**Out of the low dungeon**—*out of the hellish (höllischen) pit*. A similar expression [differing only in the preposition.—W. H. H.] is found in Ps. lxxxviii. 7. If our Poet had in mind Ps. lxxxviii., which I regard as certain, then it is probable that he used this peculiar expression in the same sense in which it is used there. Ps. lxxxviii., it is true, is commonly understood of an affliction of another kind (by leprosy, vers. 9, 16): but there is room for the question, whether this psalm, "the gloomiest of all the lamentation psalms," as DELITZSCH says, does not also apply to that gloomiest of all situations which any servant of the Lord in the Old Testament ever experienced? In that case תְּהִיטָה, *hellish*, should be understood, not of Hades itself, but of the Hades-like place in which the Prophet found himself. It would then indicate not merely the locality, but the condition of the Prophet. [See Gram. notes above. There is not necessarily in these words an allusion to Sheol, nor is *hellish pit* even a correct translation of the words, which mean literally, *a pit of low or under places, or pit of depths; out of the depths of the pit*, if not an exact

is yet a sufficiently accurate rendering. GERLACH, while he also supposes an allusion, in a figurative sense, to Sheol, translates, *aus der Grube der Tiefen, out of the pit of the depths*, meaning perhaps, figuratively, the infernal regions. But the passages in which this and similar expressions occur do not justify the idea that the pit of Hell or Sheol, *i. e. the place of the dead*, is intended, even figuratively. The literal sense *out of the pit of depths*, a poetical expression for *depths of the pit*, is most consonant with the fact that the Prophet alludes to the time when he was literally sinking in the mire at the bottom of the well.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 56. **Thou hast heard my voice.**—*Thou heardest my voice*. The Poet gratefully recognizes the fact that the Lord heard his cry,—**Hide not thine ear at my breathing, at my cry.**—[saying] *Hide not Thine ear to my refreshment, to my cry*. This is not a prayer which the speaker now addresses to the Lord [but the prayer which he did make when he was in the pit]. It is connected with קוֹלִי, *my voice*, as an explanation of the purport of that cry, and it shows what the speaker prayed for at that time.—The word רוּחָה [E. V. *breathing*, NAEGLER. *refreshment*] occurs besides here only in Ex. viii. 11 (15) [and is there rendered by Sept. ἀνάψυχς], signifies undoubtedly the obtaining breath, ἀνάψυχς (see 1 Sam. xvi. 23; Job xxxii. 20; Esth. iv. 14). It is not synonymous with שָׁמַעַת, *cry*, but it denotes the end to which the latter serves as the means. [The sense is, as given by NOYES: *Hide not Thine ear from my cry for relief*. But a more exact translation is given by BLAYNEY: *Hide not Thine ear from my relief at my cry*;—so BROUGHTON: *Hide not Thine ear from my release at my prayer*. The verb means strictly to *veil* (and is so rendered here by GERLACH, *Veil not Thine ear*), and then to *conceal, hide*. "To veil the eye is, not to look at what is set before it; and to veil the ear is, to render it deaf to what is said;" remarks OWEN, who proposes the translation *Deafen not Thine ear*. FÜRST, in his *Lex.*, says, *Turn not away Thine ear*. CALVIN renders it, *Close not Thine ear*.—**My breathing.** WORDSWORTH: "My respiration, my recovery of breath. Comp. Ex. viii. 15, the only other place where the word occurs, and where it is rendered *respite*." The word *relief* seems in accordance with the use of the word in that passage, and exactly to represent the sense it has here.—But how are these last words connected with the first words of the verse? The difficulty which has embarrassed commentators here, is one of GERLACH's arguments for taking the *perfect* verbs in a precative sense and rendering them in the *present*, which apparently meets the difficulty. But the objections to this have been stated above on ver. 55. To supply intermediate words and thoughts between the first and second members of the verse, as *Thou heardest my voice*, therefore now, in my present exigency, *hide not Thine ear, etc.*, or therefore I now an encouraged to pray *Hide not, etc.*, is at least arbitrary.* To regard the last member as indepen-

* DIONATI's comment on this verse is an instance of interpretation, where a fervid imagination supplies ideas not con-

dent of the first, an interjectional prayer, introduces an abrupt and serious break in the consecutive flow of the thought. Besides, both of these interpretations are open to the objection that שָׁמַעְתָּ קוֹלִי, *Thou heardest my voice*, is not equivalent to saying, *Thou didst answer my prayer, or receive it favorably*; a mistake that even GER-

LACH has fallen into. The word קוֹל denotes any audible sound or noise. *Thunder* (1 Sam. vii. 10), *the blast of a trumpet* (Ex. xix. 19), *the crackling of thorns under a pot* (Eccl. vii. 6), *the rustling of a shaken leaf* (Lev. xxvi. 36), *the singing of birds* (Ps. civ. 12), *the bleating of sheep and lowing of oxen* (1 Sam. xv. 14), *the roaring of a lion* (Jer. xii. 8), *the shout of a multitude and clamor of a battle* (Ex. xxxii. 17), etc., the sound of the human voice in speaking, singing, weeping, etc., are all represented by the common generic word קוֹל, a sound, a noise. In three passages the word is used in the sense of rumor, or the bruit of common fame: Gen. xlv. 16; Eccl. x. 20; Jer. iii. 9. When connected by וְ or לְ to verbs implying compliance with a request, obedience to a command, acceptance of advice, or the like, usage allows the word to stand in a specific sense for prayer, command, injunction, or the like;

as Gen. xxx. 6, שָׁמַע בְּקוֹלִי, *hath heard my voice*, i. e. my prayer. In no other case does this word, alone and by itself, signify a command, prayer, or speech, or words spoken. It does not designate articulate utterance, but the sound produced by speech, or aught else that makes a noise, or is audible. Its meaning is always evolved from the context, and when spoken words are intended, it is almost invariably followed by אָמַר, *or* some similar word. Its use in Hebrew is so purely idiomatic, that the sense may often be better given in English by its entire omission, than by a verbally literal translation. This is often done in our English version: Gen. xlv. 2, *he wept aloud*; 1 Kings xviii. 27, *cry aloud*, ver. 28, *they cried aloud*; Neh. viii. 15, *publish and proclaim*; Job xxix. 10, *The nobles held their peace*; Prov. xxvi. 25, *when he speaketh fair*, etc. In Cant. ii. 8; v. 2 (see Prof. GREEN in LANGE), and Isa. xl. 3, 6 (see EWALD), the word may be rendered as an interjection, *Hark!* It is obvious,

therefore, that קוֹל cannot be translated *prayer*. שָׁמַעְתָּ קוֹלִי can only mean *Thou heardest the sound of my voice*. What that sound was, whether of weeping, lamentation or supplication, is left to be explained, and is explained by the words following; the sound, or cry was, *Hide not Thine ear from my prayer for relief*. Similar constructions are frequent, especially with Jeremiah. Jer. iii. 21, *a sound was heard upon the high places—weeping supplications*; iv. 31, *The cry of the daughter of Zion—woe is me now! etc.*; viii. 19, *The voice of the daughter of my people—Is not Jehovah in Zion? etc.*; see Jer. xxxi. 15; Ez. iii. 12, *I heard a voice—Blessed be the glory of Jeho-*

vah, etc.; Job xxxiii. 8, 9, *I have heard the cry of words—I am clean, etc.*; iv. 16, 17, *I heard a voice—shall mortal man, etc.*; Ps. cxvi. 1, *He hath heard my voice—my supplications*; cxix. 149, *Hear my cry—Jehovah quicken me, etc.* See Isa. xxviii. 23, 24; xxxii. 9, 10; Prov. viii. 4, 5; Micah vi. 1, 2; Prov. i. 20, 22; viii. 1, 4, 5. In all these

passages the word קוֹל is immediately put into expository words. So in our text, the second member of the verse is in apposition with the first and explanatory of the word קוֹל, *Thou heardest my cry—Hide not Thine ear from my prayer for relief.*—W. H. H.]

Ver. 57. The Poet now describes what the Lord did after hearing the prayer of the suppliant.—*Thou drewest near in the day that—on the day when—I called upon Thee.* See Ps. xx. 10; lvi. 10; cii. 3; cxxxviii. 3.—*Thou saidst, Fear not.* See Jer. i. 8; xxx. 10; xlv. 27, 28.

Ver. 58. The Lord has not only spoken, but also acted. [Vers. 57, 58 are amplifications of ver. 56, showing how the Lord heard the prayer there recorded.—W. H. H.]—*O Lord, thou hast pleaded the causes of my soul.—Thou hast fought, O Lord, the fights of my soul!* It is evident that the Poet intends by these conflicts (רִיבִים) the attacks of his enemies, which he has described in vers. 52-55, and for which, from ver. 59 onward, he implores vengeance. That the struggles on which his life depended were severe, appears both from vers. 52-55 and from the following words *Thou hast rescued my life*. [The Versions generally take the words in the judicial sense, as in our English Bibles. The commentators fail to explain the significance of the metaphor. Pool's annotation is a curious instance of blindly unsaying in the note what is said in the text,—"Thou hast been wont to take my part against my enemies, not like a lawyer by word of mouth, but actually and really pleading my cause." Pleading a cause, metaphorically speaking, must at least involve the idea of securing justification, or exemption from punishment, before some legal tribunal, real or imaginary. This idea is not appropriate here, nor is it so in other places of the Bible where the same Hebrew words are similarly translated. This leads us to doubt the judicial interpretation of the terms used. Dr. NAEGELSBACH's translation is supported by Is. xlix. 25, *I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children*; xli. 11, *they that strive with thee shall perish*; xxxiv. 8, *the controversy of Zion*; Ps. xxxv. 1, E. V., *Plead my cause, O LORD, with them that strive with me: fight against them that fight against me*, where the first clause is rendered by Dr. ALEXANDER, *Oppose my opposers, strive with my strivers, or contend with my contenders*, which is recommended by the parallelism; and Jer. li. 36, E. V., *I will plead thy cause and take vengeance for thee*, which Dr. NAEGELSBACH translates, *I fight thy fight, and avenge thy vengeance*. But the words may have another meaning still. רִיב has an acquired sense, from the idea of conducting a cause before a tribunal, of managing another's affairs, and also of protecting their person, property and rights. In this sense the

tained in the words themselves; "Thou hast always been ready to relieve me when I have called upon Thee; O continue in doing so now at this present."

word seems to be used in Is. i. 17, E. V., *plead for the widow*. J. A. ALEXANDER: "*Befriend the widow, take her part, espouse her cause.* * * The common version (*plead for the widow*) seems to apply too exclusively to advocates, as distinguished from judges;"—a remark that will especially apply in the present case. The word seems to have the same sense in Is. li. 22, and Jer. i. 34. In the last the expression is לִבְיָרִים אֶת־רִיבֵם, E. V.: *He shall thoroughly plead their cause*. LUTHER and NÄGELSBACH, *He will certainly accomplish, or carry through (durchführen) thy cause*, where the idea seems to be that of zealously and successfully prosecuting the interests of another. This is the meaning which GERLACH adopts, *Thou managest the business of my soul, i. e.*, as he explains, the affairs which concern his life and his salvation. This idea of God's controlling interposition in those matters in which the Prophet's life was in jeopardy seems to me the idea here expressed.—W. H. H.]—**Thou hast redeemed my life.**—*Thou hast rescued my life.* [The propriety of connecting this verse with vers. 55-57, instead of with vers. 59, 60, and thus dismembering the triplets, is very dubious.—W. H. H.]

Vers. 59-63. These verses embrace, as remarked above, the second part of the prayer. The speaker here reminds the Lord of all the evil which he had suffered from his enemies, as the Lord Himself had seen and heard, and prays Him (vers. 62, 63) to consider well what his enemies yet continually designed against him. These verses contain a brief intimation of the prayer which he presents at large in vers. 64-66, that the Lord would execute justice (ver. 59).

Ver. 59. **LORD—Jehovah—thou hast seen.**—By these words, which are repeated in ver. 60, and the words *Thou hast heard* in ver. 61, the speaker confirms the reality of the deeds of which he accuses his adversaries. [They are also to be understood as expressions of faith in God's love, and personal interest in His saints. Not only is everything open to the eye and ear of God. But He is observing the conduct and the language of those who injure His people, with jealous indignation, which will eventually break out in judgments.—W. H. H.]—**My wrong.** The Hebrew word עֲוֹנָה, occurs only here, but the verb from which it is derived is found in ver. 36, עָוָה. If the latter is used in the sense of *bending* [deflection, subversion] and in particular of *bending of the right* [subverting one in his cause], then the noun here means, violation of right, injury illegally done to one. [CALVIN and GERLACH translate the word *oppression*, or *subversion*, suggesting judicial perversion of justice. It is generally, however, taken in the more general sense of *wrong* or *injury*. CALVIN says "the word is rendered by some *iniquity*, but in an ironical sense," i. e., the wrong my enemies impute to me. But the word is with almost entire unanimity taken in a passive sense. ROSENMUELLER: *quæ mihi fiat injuria*. NOYES: *the wrong done to me*; so BLAYNEY and BOOTHROYD.—W. H. H.]—**Judge thou my cause—judge my right.** [So BROUGHTON. GERLACH: *Secure to me right or justice*. Literally, it is *judge my judgment*, where the noun seems to be taken in the cognate sense of

my cause. See FUERST, *Lex.* NOYES: *Maintain Thou my cause.*—W. H. H.] These words are a pious ejaculation, anticipatory of the prayer fully detailed in vers. 64-66, and evidently called forth by the antithesis of עָוֹנָה, *my wrong*. To judge the right of a man is to bring it to its deserts by means of judgment. A kindred passage is Jer. v. 28. Comp. Zech. vii. 9; 1 Kings iii. 28; Is. xvi. 5. [See also Ps. ix. 5 (4).]

Ver. 60. **Thou hast seen all their vengeance.**—The word נִקְמָה is not in its original meaning *vindictiveness*, as THENIUS supposes, but simply *ultio* [taking vengeance] (comp. נִקְמָה דָם, Ps. lxxix. 10, נִקְמָה חֵיכָלוֹ, Jer. l. 28, נִקְמֹת, Ps. xciv. 1, etc.). Here also it is *vengeance*, but in an abstract-collective signification, inasmuch as his adversaries had executed on the Prophet more than one single act of vengeance. See xi. 20; xx. 12. [CALVIN: *vengeances*. GERLACH: *revengefulness*.]—**And all their imaginations against me—all their devices against me.** The Poet seems to allude to certain passages in Jeremiah, namely, xi. 19; xviii. 18, where this very same word, מַחֲשָׁבֹת, is emphatically used of the machinations of his adversaries.

Ver. 61. **Thou hast heard their reproach—reviling—O LORD—Jehovah.** See the introductory remarks above on vers. 22-24.—**And all their imaginations—all their devices—against me.**—Twice in the Book of Jeremiah the devices, מַחֲשָׁבֹת, of his adversaries are spoken of; twice also the Poet uses it here.

Ver. 62. It is better every way to refer this verse to the *Behold or observe*, הִנֵּה, of ver. 63, than to the, שָׁמְעָה, *Thou hast heard*, of ver. 61. For if referred to what precedes, ver. 62 would contain a tautology, because what is the product of *their lips* and *their thoughts* must be, in any case, substantially the same with what the Lord has heard according to ver. 61. But if ver. 62 be referred to what follows then we gain a beautiful gradation; the *lips* indicate what the enemies speak, הִנֵּינִם, *their meditation*, what they think, and *their sitting down and their rising up*, what they do. [The position of the word *Behold*, הִנֵּה, in the Hebrew, at the end of the first member of ver. 63, favors this construction. Yet it ought to be remarked, that the connection of ver. 62 with ver. 61, creates no unpleasant tautology but the repetition of the same ideas under new terms would be forcible and poetical.—W. H. H.]—**The lips stand for what they utter.** [CALVIN, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, translate *speeches*; NOYES, *words*.] See שִׁפְתַי כַּלָּם, *lips, or language of Canaan*, Is. xix. 18; *a lip or language I understood not*, Ps. lxxxi. 6 (5). Compare שִׁפְתַי כֹּזֵבִים, *utterance of my lips*, Jer. xvii. 16.—**Of those that rose up against me—my adversaries** [so BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, NOYES, ROSENMUELLER, GERLACH].—**And their device against me—and their thoughts against me.** *Thoughts*, הִנֵּינִי, meditation, Ps. xix. 15 (14). [BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD and OWEN, render the word *muttering*. HENDERSON and NOYES, *machinations*. But the sense of *meditation, thoughts*, is adopted generally.

ROSENMUELLER, *cogitatio*.—W. H. H.]—All the day long: a particular conspicuous also in Jer. xx. 7, 8.

Ver. 63. **Behold their sitting down and their rising up.**—To refer these words, with TUENIUS merely to *consensus* [sitting and deliberating together] of the enemies, is inconsistent with the context and the use of the words. For evidently, according to the context, the Lord should observe the whole conduct and doing of the enemies, and that not merely with regard to what was common to them all, but with respect to individuals. And further, according to the usage of the word, as apparent in such places as Ps. cxxxix. 2; Is. xxxvii. 28; Deut. vi. 7; xi. 19, the expression indicates the daily conduct and actions of a man. [GROTIUS: *otia et negotia*. CALVIN: “By sitting and rising, he means all the actions of life, as when David says, ‘Thou knowest my sitting and my rising,’ Ps. cxxxix. 2; that is, whether I rest or walk, all my actions are known to Thee. By rising, then, the Prophet denotes here, as David did, all the movements or doings of men; and by sitting, he means their quiet counsels; for men either deliberate and prepare for work while they sit or rise, and thus move and act.”]—**I am their music**—song. See ver. 14. He calls himself their song, their *sing-song* (EWALD), because they busy themselves with him all the day long, though in a malevolent and scornful way. As one often hums a melody to himself all day long, so they do not let the thought of the hated servant of God depart out of their heads, but are constantly devising evil against him. *I am their song* denotes, then, the result of what is said in the first member of ver. 62 [Thou hast heard their reproach], and the first member of ver. 63 [observe the lips—the language—of my enemies], and relates to all the day long, of ver. 62, and their sitting down and rising up, of ver. 63. [I am the constant subject of their derision and merriment. WORDSWORTH: “Compare the Passion Psalm, lxi. 12, *I was the song of the drunkards*. There the word *neginah* is used, here the cognate word *manginah*.”—W. H. H.]

Vers. 64-66. In these last three verses, the Poet prays directly that the Lord would take vengeance on his enemies according to their desert.

Ver. 64. **Render unto them a recompense, O LORD—Jehovah.**—according to the work of their hands. [BROUGHTON: “St. Paul translates this verse against ALEXANDER, the copper-smith, 2 Tim. iv. 14.” The phrase is borrowed from Ps. xxviii. 4.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 65. **Give them sorrow** (marg., *obstinacy*) of heart. *Thou wilt give them blindness of heart*. The word rendered *blindness*, כְּלָמָה, according to the fundamental idea of the root כָּלַם, to enclose, to veil (see כָּלַם, כְּלָמָה, כְּלָמָה), can only mean *veiling*, covering (κάλυμμα τῆς καρδίας, *veil of the heart*, 2 Cor. iii. 15). It seems then that *blindness* [CALVIN, ROSENMUELLER, NOYES, GERLACH], not *hardness* [BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON], is meant. See Deut. xxviii. 28. On what DELITZSCH (*Psychol.* p. 291) grounds his conjecture, that it may be a name for *madness*, I do not comprehend. [The opinion that the word means *madness* is derived from the Arabic, and is maintained by C. B.

MICHAELIS and A. SCHULTENS. See ROSENMUELLER, GERLACH. See Text. and Gram. notes. —By *blindness of heart* we are to understand a *reprobate mind*, involving the idea of stupidity (CALVIN) produced by sin.—If the future verbs in vers. 54, 56, are taken as Imperatives, the verb in this verse should also be so translated, *Give them blindness of heart*—W. H. H.]—**Thy curse unto them.**—upon them.

Ver. 66. **Persecute and destroy them in anger**—Pursue them in wrath and exterminate them—from under the Heavens of the LORD—Jehovah. See Deut. ix. 14, which place seems to have been in the eye of the author. [CALVIN, regarding the Heavens as designating God's throne, interprets the meaning to be that their destruction should testify the Divine sovereignty and Providence. So FAUSSET: “destroy them so, that it may be seen everywhere under heaven that Thou sittest above as Judge of the world.” This is very forced. The idea is simply that of utter extermination; destroy them so completely, *ut non sint amplius sub cælis*, that they may no longer exist under Heaven. MICHAELIS, GERLACH.—BROUGHTON concludes the chapter with the following characteristic note: “Jeremy, ch. xxiv., told how the men of the third captivity should come to nothing. And Ezekiel prophesied only in their days, but they would take no warning. This threefold alphabet endeth in their threefold and absolute destruction. Yet Ezra was of that captivity; but an infant. And of Anathoth, cursed by Jeremy, one hundred and twenty-eight returned, Ezra ii.”—The enemies of Jeremiah returned not.—W. H. H.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. [“It has been alleged, that some of the prophetic portions of Holy Scripture which foretell the sufferings of Christ, especially the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah and the sixty-ninth Psalm, have no reference to Jesus of Nazareth, but were fulfilled in the person of Jeremiah. True it is, that the language of that fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, and of that sixty-ninth Psalm, had a remarkable applicability to Jeremiah. But why was this? Because Jeremiah was not only a prophet, but a prophecy. Jeremiah is among the prophets what Job is among the patriarchs. Jeremiah is the suffering prophet. He was a signal type of ‘the Man of Sorrows.’ He was a figure of Him who suffered on the cross, and who conquered by suffering.” WORDSWORTH, *Intr. Jer.*, p. ix. “Jeremiah is called by the Christian Fathers the *πολυπαθέστατος* of the Prophets, and this qualified him to be what he is also called by them, the *συμπαθέστατος*.” *Ib.* note. “The Christian church, from ancient days, has set apart the Lamentations of Jeremiah, for her own solemn offices in the week of her Lord's Passion; and in contemplating the Prophet Jeremiah sitting amid the ruins of Zion and pouring out his sorrow there in piteous cries of agony, she has ever had a vision of Christ hanging upon the Cross, and mourning over the ruins of our fallen human nature, which caused the bitterest pangs of His anguish there.” *Ib.*, p. x.]

2. “In this chapter, the heralds of the word are admonished, that it is their duty, in times of

great distress, to prescribe to their hearers a suitable remedy for their misfortunes, the component parts of which would be, 1. The recognition of sins by means of the punishments inflicted: 2. Confidence in God's compassion: 3. Earnest prayer. As for the rest, this chapter compared with the others, shines like a star of exceeding brilliancy, from which the rays of a variety of doctrines emanate and give forth their light." FÖRSTER.

3. [I am the man. ver. 1. "This Lamentation is only rightly understood, when it is regarded as a lamentation of every pious Israelite,—as a lamentation which, while proceeding from self-experienced spiritual sorrows of the Prophet, has its truth for all pious Israelites, in whose name the Prophet speaks. ABEN EZRA, long ago, perceived this, and indicated the individual Israelites as the subject of the lamentation. In this opinion later commentators mostly concur (ROSENMUELLER, EWALD, THENIUS, NEUMANN, VAHINGER). EWALD finely says, in connection with the close of chapter second, which is so barren of consolation: 'Yet, will lamentation and despair nowhere end? Then, there suddenly appears, in the third place, a particular man; the very one who can, from his own peculiar experience, lament most profoundly, so that here for the third time the cry of despair is renewed with still greater vehemence; but he is the one who can also, from his own profoundest reflection on the eternal relation of God to humanity, come to a right knowledge of his own sins and of the necessity of repentance, and therewith also to the exercise of believing prayer. Who is this individual, who thus laments, thus thinks and prays?—whose I unconsciously, but at exactly the right place, passes over into the *we*? O man, he is the representative of thine own self! Let every one now speak and think as he does! And thus, by the direct means of this speech, begun with the greatest difficulty, the sense of pain has been imperceptibly lost in the exercise of prayer. Thus this composition shows us how in the wildest whirlpool, divine composure is to be won: each one must win it by sinking down himself into the full earnest truth; and even if one does not immediately find it, yet there is no more likely beginning for something better; wherefore here a particular individual is set before us as accomplishing in himself this most necessary work.' In this individualizing lies also the explanation of the manifold points of resemblance between our chapter and the Book of Job, from the passion-history of which the Prophet derives lamentations and images for the representation of the passion-history of Israel." Dr. ERNST GERLACH, *König. Jer.*, p. 81].

4. Vers. 1-18. "Here we have, at first, a lamentation of the Prophet Jeremiah, not so much over his people, as rather over his own misery. . . . Here we see, that the pious are subjected to two different sorts of affliction. One of these is temporal, affecting the body or worldly possessions and welfare; the other is spiritual, affecting the soul, when they think, that God has become their enemy, and will no longer be gracious to them, but will reject them now and forever. The first is, in truth, a cause of much suffering,

especially to flesh and blood; but this pain is nothing, compared with that spiritual temptation, when one can no longer confide in the favor and grace of God, as we here see in the case of Jeremiah, who so ruefully bemoans himself, that he is a wretched man, who must bear the rod of the wrath of God, who has thrust him out of the light into the darkness, and pursued him as a bear or a lion, or as a more open and declared enemy. David also experienced many of the same temptations, as we find ever and anon in his Psalms. Thine arrows stick fast in me, and Thy hand presses me sore, he says in Ps. xxxviii. 3 (2). I said in my despair, I am cut off from before the eyes of the Lord, Ps. xxxi. 23 (22): whilst at other times he had been so courageous, that he said, I was not afraid of many hundred thousands that set themselves against me round about, Ps. iii. 7 (6); God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble; therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, Ps. xlii. 2, 3 (1, 2). This sounds very differently from the lamentation here of Jeremiah, who represents God as his worst enemy. This should, first of all, serve to comfort the pious; if they fall into similar temptations, they should not think that they are the first to whom such things have happened, but should know that many pious and holy persons have experienced the same trials. But to the ungodly, this should serve as a warning; they should consider, if this is done in a green tree, what will be done in the dry? (Luke xxiii. 31). If the righteous are scarcely saved, where will the ungodly and sinner appear? (1 Pet. iv. 7)." *Württemberg. Summarien.*

5. Vers. 1-9. "Jeremiah speaks here in his own name, and whilst he utters the grief of his own heart he seeks by his example to excite others to repentance, for the key-note that sounds through all his lamentations is, that his distress comes from God. The greatest cause of distress is this, that prayer, the only resource in misery, avails no more. Elsewhere it is said, 'The name of the Lord is a strong fortress, the righteous man runneth thither and is protected,'—and, 'He who will call on the name of the Lord shall be blessed,'—or, 'Call on Me in trouble, then will I deliver thee, then thou shalt praise Me.' In truth, the Holy Scriptures are crowded with testimonies, which promise answers to prayer and help to the prayerful; indeed, since one of the titles of God is 'He who heareth prayer,' it is evident that to hear prayer is founded in His eternal nature. What then the Prophet here says is *contrary to Scripture*. But it is true, and so we must understand Jeremiah, that God not seldom hears the prayers of believers, whilst He proves their patience and leaves them long in darkness and uncertainty. This has been, as it was with Jeremiah, the common experience of Christians, who have been obliged to observe in themselves, how quickly the human heart loses courage and prayerful ardor, when God does not hasten to our help." HEIM und HOFMANN, *die grossen Propheten*.

6. "The Prophet first describes what he himself experienced of the holy cross under the Old Testament. It was necessary for him to be typically a sacrifice for all people. He was

obliged to this according to the purpose of God. God's object in all this was, to use him in His kingdom to the end of time as one of the most important of His instruments. In this respect he is indeed a real type of Christ. Although the light is not wanting in his dark sayings, yet it shines not nearly so clearly as we experience it in the New Testament, by the testimony of the Apostles, where they also testify of their cross. For they already behold His glory with their eyes. On this account Paul gloried most lovingly in his cross and his weakness." DIEDRICH.

7. "In this third chapter such an earnest, intense lamentation of the Prophet is written, that many have regarded it as referring to nothing else than to the sufferings and death of Christ. For this reason, where Christ is painted with His body lacerated with the thongs and the crown of thorns on His head, the beginning of this chapter is found recorded in Latin on the picture." EG. HUNNIUS.

8. The old expositors find here free scope for their allegorical interpretations. Thus PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, in his Preface to his third book on Lamentations, says, "The more attentively I examine this—as it were—funeral lamentation over the whole body of the people, the more profound are the mysteries which appear concerning Christ and His body, so that the mournful discourse may be by turns interpreted, now of the Synagogue, then especially of the Church, and then again of the Passion of Christ." GHISLERUS, p. 120. And of BONAVENTURA the same author remarks, that he says, "This is so evidently a lamentation for Christ and His members, whose sufferings are here described, that it is impossible to find in it a literal sense, without distortion."

9. Ver. 2. "By light he represents prosperity, by darkness adversity, Is v. 30; xlv. 7; lviii. 10; Job xxii. 11, on which last passage the great LUTHER, in a marginal gloss to the text of the German version of the Bible, comments very nervously, thus: Trouble and misfortune are called darkness, happiness and prosperity light. Here the verses of CAMERARIUS, written on 2 Chr. xx. 12, may be quoted:

In tenebris vitæ densa et caligine mundi,
Cum nihil est toto pectore consilii,
Tum nos erigimus Deus ad te lumina cordis,
Nostra tuamque fides solius auri opem."—FÖRSTER.

10. Ver. 7. "To God πᾶν ἄπορον πόριμον, i. e. To God every impassable road is passable. Of the same purport are the following sayings, which are worthy of being observed and remembered: PHILO: *deficiente omni humano concilio incipit divinum*, where human expedients fail, Divine begin; TAULERUS: *egrediente natura ingreditur Deus*, God enters when nature exits, LUTHER: *tempus desperationis tempus auxilii*, the time of despair is the time when help comes. The greater the need, the nearer is God." FÖRSTER.

11. Ver. 8. BONAVENTURA refers the words to the prayer of Christ on the Mount of Olives,—*If it be possible let this cup pass from Me* (Matt. xxvi. 39). GHISLER., p. 129.—"The Omnipotent God, knowing what is to our advantage, feigns not to hear the cry of the suffering, that He may increase their usefulness and that their lives may be purified by discipline and they may seek

elsewhere that tranquil rest, which cannot be found here." RHABANUS, in GHISLER., *Ib.*—"The most efficacious antidote (ἀλεξίφάρμακον) to this temptation is Hope (Heb. xii. 3-11), to which effect are the sayings of AUGUSTINE, God does not give quickly, that thou mayest learn to desire more ardently; and, What God would give, He withholds." FÖRSTER.

12. Ver. 8. [Prayer: "Grant, Almighty God, that as Thou didst in former times so severely chastise Thy people, we may in the present day patiently submit to all Thy scourges, and in a humble and meek spirit suffer ourselves to be chastised as we deserve; and that we may not, in the meantime, cease to call on Thee, and that however slowly Thou mayest seem to hear our prayers, we may yet persevere continuously to the end, until at length we shall really find that salvation is not in vain promised to all those who in sincerity of heart call on Thee, through Christ our Lord. Amen." CALVIN.]

13. Ver. 10. "The real appearance of the Lord is not that of a lion or a bear (Is. xxxviii. 13; Job x. 16), but of a Shepherd taking the most faithful care of His sheep. With respect to this pastoral care, see Ps. xxiii.; Is. xl. 11; Jer. xxiii. 3, 4; Ez. xxxiv. 16. And BERNARD beautifully says, Christ redems His sheep at a costly price, feeds them sumptuously, leads them with solicitous carefulness, lodges them securely." FÖRSTER.—["Harsh is the complaint when Jeremiah compares God to a bear and a lion. But we have said that the apprehension of God's wrath so terrified the faithful, that they could not sufficiently express the atrocity of their calamity; and then borne in mind must also be what we have stated, that they spoke according to the judgment of the flesh; for they did not always so moderate their feelings, but that something fell from them worthy of blame. We ought not, then, to make as a rule in religion all the complaints of holy men, when they were pressed down by the hand of God; for when their minds were in a state of confusion, they uttered much that was intemperate. But we ought, on the other hand, to acknowledge how great must be our weakness, since we see that the strongest have thus fallen, when God exercised severity towards them." CALVIN.]

14. Vers. 17, 18. "All other temptations are as nothing, compared with those in which God seems to set Himself in hostility to a man. For as long as the pious taste the grace of God and perceive His fatherly tenderness, every adversity is so much the more easily endured by them and they can be joyful and of good cheer even amidst external causes for sorrow. See Ps. lvi., lxii., lxxiii. But, on the contrary, if God disguises Himself in some severe aspect before them, and dissembles, and acts as if He hears them not, is not favorably disposed to them, but may be in the highest degree opposed to them and against their interests,—then lamentations commence, then begins that secret sorrow of the soul, that excessive anguish, under which they faint away and must sink to Hell, did not God hold His hand over them and abridge their anguish. These are the buffetings of Satan, the very dregs of hellish temptations, they are the floods of Belial that will overwhelm human

strength. Then they [the tempted] lose heart; for when, as it were, they lie in darkness, immured in an eternal prison of every kind of trouble, when the Lord closes His ears to their pitiable cry, yes, when He has bent His bow against them and set them up as a mark to shoot against them all His darts and arrows, when He has utterly ejected them from peace and all that is good, in all respects which the Prophet here relates in detail of himself, then at last they come to think, as Jeremiah did, when he said, *My strength and hope is perished from the Lord*, until God again lets the gentle sun of His Divine heavenly consolation and fatherly goodness shine out from amidst the darkness of the temptations; but in the meanwhile they must for a long time have a taste of that future wrath, which the damned must hereafter eternally suffer. Besides Jeremiah's case here, the Scripture presents us with a pitiable representation and sorrowful instance of a man thus distressed, and a special example for us, in the case of the patient Job. . . . David also in Psalm xxxi., *I said in my haste I am cut off from before Thine eyes*. Yes, even the Son of God was compelled to feel in His holy soul a similar spiritual temptation (yet without any sin), when on the cross He said, *My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?*" EGRY. HUNNIUS.—"What is here written by Jeremiah is not new and unheard of; but very many examples occur in Scripture, of those who have been harassed by this same temptation. The following examples, however, are especially appropriate here: Abraham, Gen. xvi. 1 (2); David, Ps. xxxi. 23 (22); lxxvii. 8-10 (7-9); Hezekiah, Is. xxxviii. 10. Job, vii. 15; xix. 6, 22; Jonah, ii. 5 (4); Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 9; to whom may be added, those most eminent Theologians of our own age, Matthesius, Weller and Hausmann, and especially Luther, who was obliged to sit in that sieve of Satan, particularly in the year of Christ 1527, about the time of the festival of the Visitation of Mary, concerning which paroxysm of his, by far his most violent one, D. JOH. BUGHNAGIUS has written a curious account, which is contained in Tom. iii. Jen. Germ. Fol. 401." FÖRSTER. In the Leipzig edition, this production is found in Vol. XXII., pag. 498 ff., under the Title, "*D. Jo. Pomerani und Justi Jonæ Historie von Lutheri geistlichen und leiblichen Anfechtungen anno 1527.*"—"Faith sometimes is so stifled, that even the children of God think that they are lost, and that it is all over with their salvation. . . . There is no doubt but that the Prophet also expressly reminded the faithful that they ought not to despair, . . . though the devil tempted them to despair, but that they ought then especially to struggle against it. This is indeed, I allow, a hard and perilous contest, but the faithful ought not to faint, even when such a thing happens to them, that is, when it seems to be all over with them and no hope remains: but, on the contrary, they ought nevertheless to go on hoping, and that indeed, as the Scripture says elsewhere, against hope, or above hope (Rom. iv. 18). . . . Were any one to ask, How can it be that hope and despair should reside in the same man? the answer is, that when faith is weak, that part of the soul is empty, which admits despair. Now, faith is

sometimes not only enfeebled, but is also nearly stifled. This, indeed, does not happen daily, but there is no one whom God deeply exercises with temptations, who does not feel that his faith is nearly extinguished. It is then no wonder, that despair then prevails; but it is for a moment. In the meantime, the remedy is, immediately to flee to God and to complain of this misery, so that He may succor and raise up those who are thus fallen." CALVIN.]

15. Ver. 19. "Just as wormwood tastes very bitter, but serves many useful purposes, so the cross, for the present, seemeth not to be joyous (Heb. xii. 11). Nevertheless, it is a medicine for us. Wormwood (Vermuth) has its name, thus (wehre dem Muth), control the spirit [temper, or mettle of the soul]. For wormwood restrains from lewdness, disperses the bile, neutralizes poison, and destroys all bad vermin and corruption, all of which and much more, in a spiritual sense, is done by the dear cross. Therefore, let us esteem this our spiritual medicine." CRAMER.—"Was it necessary that Christ Himself should be given gall to drink, why then should we be able entirely to abstain from the like?" CRAMER.

16. Vers. 19-33. "We see here that there are two sources of consolation, internal and external. The internal is, when one is sure in his heart that he has a gracious God, of whom he may expect every good thing in all difficulties and distresses. But this consolation sometimes expires, as we see here in the case of Jeremiah, and from the words and sayings of David, as we have shown above from his Psalms. It often seems as though God Himself, together with Heaven and Earth, is against one. How now should it be with one placed in such temptation? Answer: He should lay hold of the external consolation, which he finds, not in his heart, but in the Holy Scripture, in so many and divine consolatory declarations, which God therein presents to us, together with many examples in the cases of those to whom God has fulfilled and verified such promises. And then also he should carefully consider these heart-moving words, which Jeremiah here uses, which he did not get from his heart, for that spoke to him in a very different fashion, but he received them from the Holy Ghost; thus, It is of the Lord's goodness, that we are not consumed, His mercy fails not, but it is new every morning; The Lord is gracious unto him who waiteth for Him, and to the soul that inquires after Him; It is an excellent thing to be patient and to hope for the help of the Lord; He does not cast off for ever, but He is indeed sorry and moved by compassion according to His great mercies, etc. These and similar sayings we should, in great temptations, take hold of and hold them fast in faith, in spite even of the thoughts and objections of our own hearts. Thereby will God revive in a troubled heart the internal consolation, so that one can say with Jeremiah, Thou wilt be again graciously mindful of me, for so my soul assures me. This I take to heart, therefore I still hope." WÜRTEMB. SUMMARIEN.—"It is the habit and custom of God, first thoroughly to prove men by affliction, and after that to hear His children, if they, as fine gold and silver tried in the oven, are found to be

clean and pure. As it is again written, Whoso adheres to wisdom shall dwell securely, and although at first she sets herself in opposition to him, and brings fear and dread upon him, and proves him with her rod and tries him with her chastisements, until she finds that he is without guile, she will then return to him in the right way, and comfort him and show him her secrets. Sirach. iv. 18-21 (15-18)." EGID. HUNNIUS.

17. (Ver. 21. Prayer. "Grant, Almighty God, that as there are none of us who have not continually to contend with many temptations, and as such is our infirmity, that we are ready to succumb under them, except Thou helpst us,—O grant, that we may be sustained by Thine invincible power, and that also, when Thou wouldst humble us, we may loathe ourselves on account of our sins, and thus perseveringly contend, until, having gained the victory, we shall give Thee the glory for Thy perpetual aid in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen." CALVIN.]

18. Vers. 22-24. "These are approved texts and cordials for all stricken hearts. 1. God's mercies and compassions, which we may set over against God regarded as a consuming fire, Deut. iv. 24. 2. That *His compassions fail not*, with which we may resist the temptation, that God will no more be gracious and has forgotten our affliction and oppression, Ps. xlv. 25 (24). 3. That *His mercies are new every morning*, which we oppose to our temptation when we are compelled to say with David, I am chastened every morning, Ps. lxxiii. 14. 4. That *God is faithful*, to meet the temptation, that God will make it too hard for us to bear, 1 Cor. x. 13. 5. That *God will be our portion and reward*, that we will be richly recompensed in Heaven." CRAMER.

19. Vers. 22, 23. "The whole purport of this truly golden maxim is consolatory, and to this end it is to be pleaded in view of the magnitude of the evil both of our guilt and of our punishment. With this accord Rom. v. 21, and Ps. cxxx. 7, as well as the following from AUGUSTINE, God's compassion exceeds the misery of all mankind. The abuse of this maxim is fourfold. The first is that of the Epicureans, who, from like passages of Scripture, in which the immensity of the Divine pity is treated of, deduce that ancient piece of jargon (*κοικησιμὸν*), Let us continue in sin that grace may the more abound, Rom. vi. 1. The second abuse is that of Origen, who concluded that, because of the infinite compassion of God, the damned would at length some time or other, be liberated from the torment of Hell and be saved (Hom. ix. in Jerem.). The third abuse is that of Huber (*Samuelis mort.*, 1624), who, from the amplitude and universality of God's compassion, presumed to fabricate the doctrine of universal and unlimited election. The fourth abuse is that of the Photinians, who so far expand the words of Scripture concerning the compassion of God, as blasphemously to assert, that God, out of His mere compassion alone, forgives our sins, without any compensation and satisfaction rendered by Christ." FÖRSTER.

20. Ver. 24. "LUTHER has finely comprised the distinction between hope and faith, in the following well-rounded period: Faith looks at the word which promises, Hope at the thing promised,

(*Fides intuetur verbum rei, spes vero rem verbi*)."
FÖRSTER.—["Were God to take away the promise, all the miserable would inevitably perish: for they can never lay hold on His mercy except through His word. This, then, is the reason why Scripture so often connects these two things together, even God's mercy and His faithfulness in fulfilling His promises." CALVIN.]

21. [Vers. 24, 25. "It next occurred to the Prophet, that whatever he lost or suffered, or witnessed of the sufferings of his people, his grand interest was secure. He was satisfied that the Lord was his all-sufficient Portion. He was conscious that he had chosen Him as his portion, and expected his happiness from Him, and not from the world; and therefore he determined still to hope in Him, and refer all his concerns to His wisdom, truth, and love. In this he evidently proposed himself as an example to his people, that they might seek comfort from God when all other comfort failed. And though they might not be able confidently to aver that the Lord was their Portion, yet they might remember that He was kind and merciful to those who wait for Him and seek Him." SCOTT.]

22. Ver. 25. "When we men are in trouble or temptation, the Devil is accustomed to portray and represent God to us as very different from what He really is. For he depicts him as an ungracious, pitiless, wrathful Judge, not to be treated with, who would only kill us and damn us and not wish us to be happy, and thus the Devil would frighten us and drive us to despair. We should remove our eyes from this frightful image of Satan's conjuring, and look upon the Lord as the Prophet Jeremiah here depicts for us His countenance, as it were; yea, as God portrays Himself in His holy word, namely thus, The Lord is friendly to the soul that seeks after Him." EGID. HUNNIUS.

23. Ver. 25. "God's love both prepares the way for and rewards ours. Being more benignant it precedes ours; being more faithful it is returned [by ours]; being more attractive it is sought after. It is rich to all who invoke its aid, yet has nothing better than its own self. It devotes itself to the deserving, reserves itself for a reward, applies itself to the souls of the saints for their refreshment, gives itself in payment for the redemption of the captive. Thou art good, O Lord, to the soul of him who seeks Thee. How gracious, then, to him who finds Thee! But here indeed is something wonderful, that no one can successfully seek Thee unless he have first found Thee. Dost Thou, therefore, wish to be found that Thou mayest be sought; to be sought, that Thou mayest be found? Thou art one who can be sought and found, yet not prevented (*præveniri*). For although we say, 'In the morning shall my prayer prevent Thee,' Ps. lxxxviii. 14 (13), yet there is no doubt that all prayer is lifeless that inspiration has not prevented (*non præveniret*)." BERNARDUS in libro de diligendo Deo, quoted by GHISLER. p. 144.

24. [Vers. 25, 26. "God is good to all His creatures; but in particular to them that wait for Him, to the soul that seeks Him. While trouble is prolonged and deliverance deferred, we must patiently wait for God's gracious returns to us; and while we wait for Him by faith, we must seek Him

by prayer; they that do so will find it good, ver. 26, and to hope that *the Salvation of the Lord* will come, though difficulties lie in the way, to wait till it does come, though it be long delayed; and while we wait to be quiet and silent, not quarrelling with God, or making ourselves uneasy, but acquiescing in the Divine disposals; *Father, Thy will be done!* If we call this to mind, we may have hope that all will end well at last." MATR. HENRY.]

25. Ver. 26. "In the practice of Christianity, hope and patience, the most efficient of virtues, engage mutually in common labors, and neither without the other can discharge its duty." FÖRSTER.—"The little herb, Patience, does not grow in every body's garden. But we are admonished to seek it, because, 1. It is a very precious virtue, and a part of the service we owe to God, according to the first table. 2. It contains in itself another virtue, namely, hope in God. 3. It is easier for us to practice it, if we accustom ourselves to it from our youth. 4. It can overcome many wrongs, abuses and outrages. 5. Misfortune will not continue for ever, Is. liv. 7. 6. At all events the end will be favorable. 7. God does not willingly afflict us (*from His heart*), but always designs something different and better for us, and dearly wishes that He might not punish us at all (Hos. xi. 9)." CRAMER.

"God, when He takes my goods and chattels hence,
Gives me a portion, giving patience.
What is in God is God; if so it be
He patience gives, He gives Himself to me."

ROBERT HERRICK.]

26. Vers. 26-36. "These are admirable and, beyond measure, comforting words, with which the holy Prophet opens the abyss of God's mercy and comforts therewith himself and the people. As if he would say, It is against God's nature to subject us to such hard discipline, and to let us be driven and injured by the world. But He does it for the very best reason, not to ruin, but rather to edify, not to grieve but to fill with joy forever. For He is not of the disposition of the children of men, who, if their anger is once excited, there is no end to it. But God, although He causes grief, and lets His wrath, sternness, and justice be seen, yet He is again moved to pity as soon as men cordially repent of their sin and transgression. Therefore, this present captivity should not be regarded as if He had eternally rejected His poor people, and would never turn their captivity, or as if He would indeed allow His captives to be trodden under foot, or, much less, as if he would subvert the right of a man, or allow his cause to be turned aside before the Most High, as if the Lord saw it not, or knew nothing of it. Far be it from this! He knows and sees how cruelly the tyrants oppress their captives; He, moreover, graciously regards the patience of the oppressed, and will help them again according to His mercies." EGR. HUMPHRUS.

27. Ver. 27. "It is added here that a man should be accustomed to cross-bearing (*τῇ σταυροποσίᾳ*) from his youth. And we may also with propriety apply here that saying of the Poet, *A teneris assuescere multum est*, There is great advantage in being accustomed to a thing from a tender age. For patience begets experience (Rom. v. 4),—experience, I mean, in matters of cross-bearing. Vexation gives understanding

(Is. xxviii. 19, [Vulg. and Douay]). But what doth he know that hath not been tried? (Sir. xxxiv. 9). For, as NAZIANZEN puts it, *οὐ πρόσωπα χριστιανισμοῦ, ἀλλὰ πίστις*, Christianity is faith, not outward appearances. And LUTHER says, Unexperienced persons are merely unprofitable theorizers. But since it is of advantage, in order to become more fully acquainted with any course of discipline, that one should be subjected to it from a tender age, so does it especially conduce to the acquisition of experience in matters of cross-bearing, if one is trained in them from his youth." FÖRSTER.—"Jeremiah himself bore the yoke in his youth. He was very young, according to Jer. i. 6, when he was called to the prophetic office (in the 13th year of Josiah), and from the beginning he experienced much opposition and many trials, hence after eighteen years under Joakim and eleven years under Zedekiah, he was able to endure yet severer persecution. The earlier he had learned to bear the yoke, the better was he able to bear it later in life. It is a golden truth that is here expressed. The cases of Joseph and David also confirm it. A youth of hardships has already brought forth much fruit of godliness, and educated many staunch men for the kingdom of God. Therefore be thou also reconciled to a youth of hardship." CALWER, *Handbuch der Bibelerklärung*.—"We ought not only to bear the yoke, but to bear it in our youth. For if we bear it late in life, we begin by exercising penitence for the past, rather than by acquiring strength. Let us then anticipate the flight of the years of our youth by suitable discipline, that we may each of us say, O God, who feeblest [E. V., *Thou hast taught*] me from my youth (Ps. lxxi. 17); rather than be obliged to lament at the remembrance of our faults, saying, Remember not the sins of my youth and of my ignorance (Ps. xxv. 7 [See Vulg.])." AMBROSE, *Serm.* 2, on Ps. cxix. 9.—*Deus vult longi prælii militem*, God chooses the soldier who has passed through a long fight. HILARY's *Exposition* of Ps. cxix. 9, quoted by GHISLER., p. 146.—"What praise is due to old men, if failing in strength and having been released from long continued labor, they prefer to take their rest? On the other hand, what glory is due to young men, when in the very fervor of youth itself, they moderate their lives by a regimen of strict morality?" CASSIODORUS, in Ps. cxix. 83, quoted by GHISLER., p. 147.

28. [Ver. 28. "He has learnt that necessary lesson of independence, that shows him how he is to serve himself; to give no trouble to others; and keep his troubles, as far as possible, in his own bosom." ADAM CLARKE.]

29. Ver. 29. *אִם כֵּן*, if so be, *peradventure*. "This particle affords to the Romanists no support for their fiction of doubt.* LUTHER's interpretation may be seen in his marginal note on Joel ii. 14." FÖRSTER.

30. Ver. 30. "It may be asked here, whether this sentence refers to toleration [the passive. non-resistant endurance of evil]; whether the words, *if any one is struck on the cheek, etc.,*

*I. e., in regard to God's willingness to pardon, on which they rest the necessity of propitiating Him by penance.—W. H. H.]

may not seem to support the Anabaptists, who endeavor to prove, from this and similar passages of Scripture, especially from Matt. v. 39, 40, that all species of revenge is forbidden to Christians? But a distinction must be made between public and private, and lawful and unlawful revenge." FÖRSTER.

31. [Vers. 31-33. PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that as it is expedient for us to be daily chastised by Thy hand, we may willingly submit to Thee, and not doubt, but that Thou wilt be faithful, and not prove us with too much rigor, but that Thou wilt consider our weakness, so that we may thus calmly bear all Thy chastisements, until we shall at length enjoy that perfect blessedness, which is now hid to us under hope, and as it were sealed, until Christ Thy Son shall reveal it at His coming. Amen." CALVIN.]

32. Ver. 33. "*He does not afflict men from His heart.*" This is not to be understood absolutely (*ἀπλῶς*), but comparatively, namely, with respect to [what may be called] God's *own special work*, which consists not in afflicting, but in doing good. Briefly, His disposition towards us is like that of a father towards his son, in reference to which AUGUSTINE very beautifully says, He is both a father and a God when He caresses; and when He smites, still is He a father. . . . With which agrees this saying of NAZIANZEN: *Μεῖζον τὸ μέτρον τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον τῆς παιδαγωγίας.* The measure of His philanthropy exceeds the measure of His severity as a disciplinarian." FÖRSTER.—"The very essence of His being inclines Him to bless, therefore it is written, *He does not afflict from His heart His children of the human race*; but if they despise His blessing, it is His to smite and requite them with the greater severity." THOLUCK, *Stunden Christl. Andacht*, XXII., S. 120.

"Deines Wesens Wesen nur die Liebe ist,
Strenge nur bei Dir aus lauter Liebe fließt."—
Ib., *Andacht*, XXX., S. 171.

32. [Vers. 34-39. PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that as we are at this day tossed here and there by so many troubles, and almost all things in the world are in confusion, so that wherever we turn our eyes, nothing but thick darkness meets us,—O grant that we may learn to surmount all obstacles, and to raise our eyes by faith above the world, so that we may acknowledge that governed by Thy wonderful counsel is everything that seems to us to happen by chance, in order that we may seek Thee, and know that help will be ready for us through Thy mercy whenever we humbly seek the pardon of our sins, through Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen." CALVIN.]

33. Vers. 37, 38. "In respect to the sins of men, He is not entirely inactive. Not, indeed, as if He took pleasure in their sins, or moved men to commit them, or had ordained men to their sins. That be far from Him! But because from the very first He had entire knowledge of them [Jer. xliii. 24; Ps. cxxxix. 7-12; Job xxiv. 23; Sir. xxiii. 27, 28; Wis. i. 6-10]. . . . Therefore it follows, that all the punishments of sin are sent and controlled by God, to His own people, indeed, for the purpose of discipline, but to the ungodly, for their punishment [Is. xlv. 7; Am. iii. 6]. . . . Therefore that is an execrable

error of some of the heathen philosophers, who taught that what happened to a man, whether good or evil, came by chance, even as his luck befell him: but that God troubled Himself with the affairs of men, was not to be thought of: but that He sits in Heaven, in undisturbed repose, and lets men here, between themselves, plunge, wade or swim as they can, since He takes no concern in their affairs." EGID. HUNNIUS.—"*Who then can say that anything is done without the Lord's command?*" This is a precious word. For first, all adversaries, however lively their devices may be, are only messengers and servants of my Lord, and must obey Him, when He has purposes of love in my behalf for them to accomplish. And, as LUTHER says, Our God is entire Master of the art of whipping a rogue by the hands of others.

. . . For the rest, I should not regard the thoughts and devices of all my adversaries, but the loving purposes which my Lord intends to accomplish by them, as David sings, He has spread a table for me in the presence of mine enemies, and filled my cup to overflowing. Whilst they rage and roar, be of good cheer and say, St. Peter cannot prevent God from giving what He will. . . .

Ihr Heben Feinde sorgt so viel, mir Noth und Gram zu machen,
Seht doch, ihr seid Handlanger blos in meines Herren Sachen!
Wohl grämte ich mich bitterlich, wenn ich es nicht erkannte,
Dass doch mein Herr der Wundarzt ist und ihr nur Instrumente.

Wie selig, wer er hat erkannt, dass aller Fäden Enden
Von aller Menschen Werk und Wort ruhn doch in Göttes Händen.

There is then only one real misfortune for men on earth, and that is *Sin*!" THOLUCK, *St. Christl. Andacht*, XXVIII., S. 162.

34. Ver. 38. "Two words occur here which need to be more accurately defined. The first question is, what is the exact idea of *evil* in this passage? CALVIN, too, broadly extends its meaning so as to cover all the evils that are done, and that happen in the world, thus not obscurely embracing all *sins*. But from the context even a blind man may perceive, that the Prophet is not speaking of evil in general, . . . but in fact of that particular species of evil, which is usually called the evil of punishment. For the evil of crime, as such, evidently cannot and ought not to be in any manner attributed to God as its author or producing cause [Dent. xxxii. 4; Ps. v. 5 (4); Rom. ix. 14; 1 John i. 5; James i. 13]; but the evil of punishment is, here and in various other places in the Sacred Scriptures, imputed to God as a just Judge [Is. xlv. 7; Am. iii. 6; Sir. xl. 32]. The other word referred to, is that translated *commandeth* (*τὸ jubere*). In the Hebrew it is *יָצַו*. . . . CALVIN twists this word to mean the secret decrees of God, by which He bends the purposes of men hither and thither, according to His own arbitrary will. Whence he infers, that *nothing* is done without the command and foreordination of God. He adduces the example of Shimei [2 Sam. xvi. 5, 10], who had command to curse. If he had understood this with reference to the evil of punishment, his words would have borne the appearance at least of truth. But what CALVIN in this passage makes so broad, that he writes, *Nothing* can be done without the Divine mandate, including sins like-

wise, cannot and ought by no means to be allowed; for the contrary is most clearly attested by what is written in Jer. xix. 5; xxiii. 32; xxix. 23; Sir. xv. 10-22." FÖRSTER.—["Let us now see how God commands what is wrongly and foolishly done by men. Surely He does not command the ungodly to do what is wicked, for He would thus render them excusable; for where God's authority interposes, there no blame can be. But God is said to command whatever He has decreed, according to His hidden counsel. There are, then, two kinds of commands; one belongs to doctrine, and the other to the hidden judgments of God. The command of doctrine, so to speak, is an evident approbation which acquits men; for when one obeys God, it is enough that he has God as his authority, though he were condemned by a hundred worlds. . . . But God is said to command according to His secret decrees what He does not approve, as far as men are concerned. So Shimei had a command to curse, and yet he was not exempt from blame; for it was not his purpose to obey God; nay, he thought that he had offended God no less than David [2 Sam. xix. 19, 20]. Thus this distinction ought to be understood, that some things are commanded by God, not that men may have it as a rule of action, but when God executes His secret judgments by ways unknown to us. Thus, then, ought this passage to be understood, even that nothing is carried on without God's command, that is, without His decree, and, as they say, without His ordination. It hence appears, that those things which seem contingent, are yet ruled by the certain providence of God, so that nothing is done at random. And what philosophers call accident, or contingent (*ἐνδεχόμενον*), is necessary as to God; for God decreed before the world was made whatever He was to do; so that there is nothing now done in the world which is not directed by His counsel. * * * Now they who object and say that God is thus made the author of evils, may be easily refuted; for nothing is more preposterous than to measure the incomprehensible judgment of God by our contracted minds. . . . This, then, is our wisdom, to embrace only what the Scripture teaches. Now, when it teaches us that nothing is done except through the will of God, it does not speak indiscriminately, as though God approved of murders, and thefts, and sorceries, and adulteries; what then? even that God by His just and righteous counsel so orders all things, that He still *will not iniquity* and abhors all injustice. . . . How much soever the most wicked may indulge themselves in their vices, He still rules them, . . . that He may *punish sins with sins*, as Paul teaches us, for he says that God gives up to a reprobate mind those who deserve such a punishment, that He gives them up to disgraceful lusts, that He blinds more and more the despisers of His word (Rom. i. 28; 2 Thess. ii. 10). And then God has various ways, and those innumerable and unknown to us. . . . Thus we see that God is not the author of evils, though nothing happens but by His nod and through His will,—for far different is His design from that of wicked men. . . . In a word, as far as the Heavens are from the earth, so great is the difference between the works of God and the deeds of men, for the ends,

as I have said, are altogether different." CALVIN.]

35. Ver. 39. "The danger here is, that very few sufficiently examine themselves. Whoever does this will discover, how God punishes our sins, and we suffer no undeserved distress." HEIM u. HOFFMANN, *die grossen Propheten*.—It is usual with unrenowned men commonly, to become enraged at him who punishes them, even when their punishment is entirely just. Thus we read in the Revelation of John (xvi. 9, 11, 21), that men will blaspheme the name of God, who pours out the vials of His wrath upon them, and that they will not repent of their sins. This perversity of the heart, which mistakes right for wrong, and wrong for right, will reach its utmost height in the last days, but its roots reach back to the beginning of the world, where they started with the lies of the Serpent (Gen. iii. 4, 5).—"The evils of punishment are only the effects, or fruits, of the evils of sin (Rom. vi. 23; Jas. i. 15). Hence AUGUSTINE says, with great propriety, 'Punishment daily increases, because sin increases daily; the chastisements of God continue without cessation, because crimes among the people are equally persistent.' But, on the other hand, AMBROSUS says, with truth; 'God had been ready to change His sentence, if thou hadst been willing to amend thy wickedness by penitence.'" FÖRSTER.

36. Vers. 40-42. ["How are we to get the pardon of our sins? The Prophet tells us:—1. Let us examine ourselves. 2. *Let us turn again to the Lord*. 3. *Let us lift up our heart*; let us make fervent prayer and supplication for mercy. 4. *Let us lift up our hand*; let us solemnly promise to be His, and bind ourselves in a covenant to be the Lord's only: so much *lifting up the hand to God* implies. Or, let us put our heart on our hand and offer it to God: so some have translated this clause. 5. *We have transgressed*; let our confession of sin be fervent and sincere. 6. And to us who profess Christianity it may be added, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ as having died for thee*; and thou shalt not perish, but have everlasting life." ADAM CLARKE].

37. Vers. 40, 41. "When Jeremiah says, *Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord*; let us lift up our hearts with our hands unto God in the heavens; he reminds us of the proper method to be observed in prayer, namely, sincere confession of sin and repentance must precede our petitions. For we know that God does not hear impenitent sinners (John ix. 31). This method God Himself also has taught us to observe, since He says in Is. i. 15, *If ye make many prayers, I will not hear you. Why? For your hands are full of blood*. But He immediately adds good counsel: *Wash and make yourselves clean, put away your evil doings from before Mine eyes, then come and let us reason together*." WÜRTEMB. *Summarien*.

38. Vers. 39-42. "Here two very different kinds of murmuring are indicated. One that of the ungodly which Isaiah has described, viii. 21, If they suffer hunger, they will fret themselves and curse their king and their God. But besides this, a very salutary kind of murmuring is suggested, which is not directed against God or men, but consists in a man's being discontented

with himself and fretting over his sins and forsaking them, and in examining his life that he may know how wicked he has been, since he has not been afraid to sin before the face of God, most holy (Is. lxiv. 6; Dan. ix. 5-14). . . . But that prayer and confession of sins may be acceptable to God, it is required, that not only the mouth may pray, but, as Jeremiah says, the heart and the hands must be lifted up to heaven. For where the mouth only prays, and the heart is not in it, God esteems such spiritless prayer as little as the prayer of those Pharisees and heathen, who, when they wished to pray, babbled much with their mouths, without spirit or sincerity (Matt. vi. 5-8; Is. xxix. 13). . . . Yet we learn from these few brief words of the Prophet Jeremiah, that prayer is not to be deferred too long, nor delayed by impenitence. Otherwise it will be too late to call on God and come to Him with prayer, as happened to the Jews, who delayed their repentance and prayer till God's wrath was already kindled. And when they afterwards called on God, it availed nothing (with regard to averting spiritual punishment), therefore they uttered this lamentation, Thou hast covered Thyself with a cloud, that no prayer could pass through (Is. i. 15; lix. 1-3; Mic. iii. 4; Prov. i. 28.)" EGID. HUNNIUS.

39. Ver. 41. "In such prayer we must persevere, and not as it were desist if help does not come immediately, but must always continue to pray, till the Lord look down from Heaven and behold us, as Jeremiah here says. For God has not such tender ears that He would soon grow weary of hearing, as those men of whom it is said, a beggar may be neither poor nor worthy, —but they will treat him graciously, if he persist tenaciously in his entreaties (Luke xi. 9; Col. iv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 17)." *Würtemb. Summarien.*

Ut tua pertingat penetretque in oratio cœlum,
Corde sit ex puro, sit brevis atque frequens.—FÖRSTER.

["*Let us lift up our heart with our hands,—the antidote to hypocrisy. Ps. lxxxvi. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 8.*" FAUSSET].

40. Vers. 42, 43. ["The Prophet proceeded to direct the confessions of his people and to put words into their mouths. He humbly acknowledges that they had transgressed and rebelled against God; and as He had not pardoned, it was plain they had not repented; this was the cause of all their miseries, of which he led them humbly and submissively to complain to the Lord. He had covered them with His anger, pursued them by His judgments, and destroyed them without pity: and He had so covered Himself with a thick cloud, that their prayers could find no admission. The hypocritical prayers of the people for deliverance were rejected; and even the fervent prayers of the Prophet in that behalf were discouraged." SCOTT.—"If the Lord has not pardoned our sins, we may be sure, that it is because we have not repented and believed His Gospel: yet we may be forgiven, even though we have not the comfort of it." SCOTT.]

41. Ver. 44. "This cloud is not physical but mystical, a cloud, namely, condensed from the mists and vapors of our sins, the Holy Spirit thus interpreting it in Is. lix. 1, 2; Ps. lxxvi. 18;

John ix. 31. With which agrees that saying of AUGUSTINE, *Prefecti peccatores sunt Dei illusores non oratores*, Hardened sinners mock God, they do not pray to Him. If therefore we wish our prayers to be heard, this cloud must be dispersed by true and sincere repentance, as Isaiah exhorts, i. 15-18." FÖRSTER.—"However it may have an angry and threatening appearance, that God should draw a dark cloud-covering over His face, yet after all it is no iron wall, but only a cloud that may be easily dissipated, and when God removes our sins as a veil (Is. xlv. 22), then He drives this cloud away." CRAMER.

42. Vers. 44-49. ["The prolonging of troubles is sometimes a temptation, even to praying people, to question whether God be what they have always believed Him to be, a prayer-hearing God; and the distresses of God's people sometimes prevail to that degree, that they cannot find any footing for their faith, nor keep their head above water, with any comfortable expectation." HENRY.]

43. Ver. 50. "*Till the Lord behold from Heaven.* This phrase is found also in Ps. cii. 20 (19); xiv. 2; xxxiii. 13; Gen. xviii. 21. ZANCHIUS († 1590) endeavors to prove from this expression that Heaven in which God is said to dwell, is a place in the created universe (*ens creatum*) above the visible heavens. But this is absurd. For it would follow, 1. That God is not everywhere, but is contained in Heaven, which is contrary to the doctrine taught in 1 Kings viii. 27. 2. That the birds in the air are nearer God, than are the pious and faithful on earth; thus AUGUSTINE argues (Book 2, the Sermon on the Mount, ch. ix.), If the habitation of God is believed to be in the Heavens, regarded as the higher parts of the world, then the birds are in reality better off than we, for their life is nearer to God." FÖRSTER.

44. Ver. 51. "His grief is so great, that it is not diminished by tears (as it ought to be, according to the ordinary course of nature), as the Poet says,

Expletur lacrymis, egeriturque dolor,

[*Ovid, Tristia*, 4, 3, 38], (appeased by tears and spent is grief), but rather is so intensified that it consumes his soul, *i. e.* his life, the heart, the seat of life, being consumed." FÖRSTER.

45. Ver. 53. "We are aroused to fervent prayer, by our own special calamity, as by an alarm-bell. Thus the people of God here acknowledge, that in the deepest anguish, when almost sunk into the ground in the graves of the lost, they had called on the name of the Lord and had been heard. As often then as God now casts a man into the grave, that is to say, lets him sink into some temporal misfortune or mental despair, he should remember that he is thereby summoned to prayer, that he should lift his heart to God and call upon Him with sighing and weeping." EG. HUNNIUS.

46. Ver. 55. "The prayer of the righteous," says AUGUSTINE, is the key of Heaven; as prayer ascends, the compassion of God descends." FÖRSTER.

47. Vers. 48-66. "Jeremiah thought that injustice was done him, although he did not regard himself as innocent before God, but ascribed

everything that befell him and his people, to his own sins and to the sins of the people; yet he held that injustice was done him by his enemies, who persecuted him on account of the word of God. And in the same way may one, when he suffers wrong from his enemies, appeal to his innocence before God and men, as David says, Lord do me justice, for I am innocent (Ps. xvi. 1). But before God no one should esteem himself guiltless, but we should remember that the evil which befalls us undeservedly at the hands of our enemies, is deservedly sent upon us by God, on account of other sins, that we should repent of. In repentance, moreover, no one should look and wait for others, before he himself makes a beginning, but as Jeremiah here sets an example of repentance before others, so should every one else do. Then, at least, there will be a general repentance, and God will regard our repentance and will hear us according to His promise, for which we shall praise Him for ever and ever. Amen." *Würtemb. Summarien.*

48. Ver. 57. ["**Fear not.** How powerful is this word when spoken by the Spirit of the Lord to a disconsolate heart. To every mourner we may say, on the authority of God, *Fear not!* God will plead thy cause, and redeem thy soul."] CLARKE.]

49. Ver. 60. ["**Thou hast seen.** Everything is open to the eye of God. Distressed soul! though thou knowest not what thy enemies meditate against thee; yet He who loves thee does, and will infallibly defeat all their plots, and save thee." CLARKE.—"As soon as any trial assails us, we imagine that God is turned away from us; and thus our flesh tempts us to despair. It is hence necessary that the faithful should in this respect struggle with themselves and feel assured that God has seen them. Though, then, human reason may say, that God does not see, but neglect and disregard His people, yet on the other hand, this doctrine ought to sustain them, it being certain that God does see them. This is the reason why David so often uses this mode of expression." CALVIN.]

50. Ver. 60. "*Quæ hic tormenta, erunt illic ornamenta.* What are our torments here, will be our ornaments there." AUGUSTINE.

51. Vers. 64-66. With regard to prayer against enemies, see Doctrinal and Ethical remarks on i. 20-22.—[Prayer. "Grant, Almighty God, that as at this day ungodly men and wholly reprobate so arrogantly rise up against Thy Church, we may learn to flee to Thee, and to hide ourselves under the shadow of Thy wings, and fully to hope for Thy salvation; and that, however disturbed the state of things may be, we may yet never doubt but that Thou wilt be propitious to us, since we have so often found Thee to be our deliverer; and that we may thus persevere in confidence of Thy grace and mercy, and be also roused by this incentive to pray to Thee, until having gone through all our miseries, we shall at length enjoy that blessed rest which Thou hast promised to us through Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen." CALVIN.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. Vers. 1-18. *The lamentation of the Prophet.*

1. A source of consolation to the pious in severe temptation. 2. A solemn warning to the ungodly. "We learn, here, how God often permits even His dearest children and the most holy of His chosen ones to be deeply tempted on earth, that they may have to some extent a taste of the agony of Hell. . . . But the ungodly, who live in this world tranquilly and happily, should regard the case of the righteous as a mournful foretelling of the pains of Hell, whereby they will yet, at some time, as by a mighty thunder-clap, be awakened out of their profound and dangerous sleep of false security." EG. HUNNIUS.

2. Vers. 19-21. *How he who is tempted should strengthen himself in severe affliction.* 1. He should lament his sorrow unto the Lord (pour out his heart before Him, Ps. lxxii. 9 (8); cii. 1 (*title*); cxlii. 3 (2)). 2. He should be assured that God is mindful of him (by Christ we have the knowledge of Divine Adoption, Rom. viii. 15, 16). 3. He should, on this account, rejoice in hope (Rom. xii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 16; Rom. v. 2).

3. Vers. 22, 23. Sermon on a special day of fasting and prayer by the court-preacher GRÜNEISEN, in PALMER'S *ev. Casual-Reden*, Bd. 1., S. 271. "Our text instructs us, 1. How God, even in times of affliction, shows His regard for us. 2. How we also, in such affliction, should show our regard for God."

4. Vers. 22, 23. "*With what we may comfort ourselves when we feel that we are forsaken.* 1. The goodness of the Lord, that helps to sustain us, so that we are not utterly overwhelmed. 2. The compassion of the Lord, which we experience every day. 3. The faithfulness of the Lord, which enables us to hope firmly in the fulfilment of all His promises." FLOREY, *bibl. Wegweiser für geistliche Grabreden*, Nr. 46.

5. Vers. 24, 25. "*The happiness of a believing soul even in painful circumstances.* 1. The consolation which it takes to itself.—*God is my portion.* 2. The resolution to which it is stimulated,—*I will hope in Him.* 3. The experience it makes proof of,—*the Lord is gracious.*" FLOREY, *ib.* Nr. 47.

6. Vers. 26, 27. "*The benefits of early affliction.* 1. They teach at a time when men are most susceptible of instruction; and they teach them [what they most need to learn at that time of life] to recognize the vanity of earthly things and to give heed to the Word of God. 2. They purify at a time when the heart is in the greatest danger of being corrupted; and they purify them from [those besetting sins of youth] selfishness and sensuality. 3. They strengthen them at a time when strength is weakest and temptations to sin are the strongest; and they strengthen them especially to patient endurance on this earth and separation from this earth." FLOREY, *ib.* Nr. 48. See TROST und MAHNUNG an Gräbern, ii. Bändch., S. 154.

7. Vers. 27-33. *The chastisements of the Lord.* 1. He chastises not for the sake of making men miserable (ver. 33). 2. He chastises not forever (vers. 31, 32). 3. He chastises that we may learn, (1) patience (vers. 27, 28), (2) silence, quietness (ver. 29), (3) meekness (ver. 30), (4) hope (ver. 29).

8. Vers. 27-33. *The Divine discipline.* 1. Its source; Love (vers. 31-33). 2. Its means; Sor-

row and joy (vers. 27-33). 3. Its aim; the perfecting of the man of God (vers. 27-30, see 2 Tim. iii. 17).

9. Vers. 31-33. "*The blessed change with which believing Christians may console themselves.* 1. After pain follows pleasure. 2. After death, life. 3. After separation, a restoration." FLOREY, as above, Nr. 49.

10. Ver. 32. "*The history of the year's harvest an image of our history for the year.* The resemblance appears in these respects: 1. How finely the whole country looked; 2. With what difficulty it withstood the power of the storm; 3. How, nevertheless, God's hand has protected us." BEYER S. E. (in *Plauen, Harvest Sermon*, 1866.

11. Vers. 37, 38. "*No misfortune happens without God's will.* 1. This is a great comfort to those on whom misfortune has fallen; for (1), they will not vex themselves unnecessarily with self-inflicted reproaches; (2), they will be more susceptible to the voice of the Gospel; (3), they will humble themselves under the mighty hand of God. 2. This is a strong support for the confidence in God of those who properly consider it: for (1), they will be freer from anxious cares; (2), stronger in their reliance on God's guidance; (3), they will be more perfect in the spiritual man. 3. This is a solemn warning to those who embrace this opinion; (1), that they do not sin against the wisdom of God; (2), that they do not violate brotherly love; (3), that they do not forestall the judgment of God's word." Florey, same as above, Nr. 251. See *Trost und Mahnung an Gräbern*, i. Bächen. s. 216.

12. Vers. 18-39. Sermon of G. CHR. DEICHERT on Midlent Sunday (see *Stern aus Jakob, Stuttg., Liesching*, 1867: "This Lenten Sunday brings us into sorrow's school, where we shall learn hope in God, under severe chastisement and in bitter trouble; where we shall learn submissive meekness, and yet have hours of respite, when we may take breath, gather fresh strength, and address ourselves anew to the conflict. But the first thing is that we pass the examination [or trial for entrance into this school]."

13. Vers. 39-42. "Weighty words for every one who is under the cross and in trouble. This, then, is no time for unbelieving, impatient, impenitent murmuring, but a time when we should examine ourselves, and learn in what respects we deserve what the Lord says to us, by means of such chastisements, and when we should submit patiently to His will, who smites us righteously, and thus implore grace." CALWER *Handbuch Bibelerklärung*.—"If God chastises the sinner, but with measure, so that He still spares his life, then should not man, whose life is

spared by the grace of God, lament on account of God's righteousness, and on account of the punishment of his own sins; rather every one should lament on account of his own sin, which has brought that punishment upon him; every one should complain of himself (not of God), for this is an indication of true penitence." LISCO.

14. Vers. 39-42. *The murmuring that is forbidden and that which is commanded.* 1. Forbidden, because unjustifiable, is murmuring over the evil we are obliged to suffer as a punishment of our sins (vers. 39, 42). 2. Commanded, is murmuring over our sins, by which we have offended God; and this is right only when it results (1), in sincere repentance (ver. 40); (2), in hearty prayer for God's grace.

15. Vers. 44-50. *Of wrestling with God in prayer.* 1. This presupposes an attack that God has made upon us, through the cross and trouble (vers. 45-47, comp. vers. 1-17). 2. It consists (1), on our part, in vehement prayer (vers. 48, 49); (2), on God's part, in the repeated rejection of our prayer (ver. 44.) 3. It ends (1), on our part, with believing perseverance in prayer; (2), on God's part, with God-like acceptance of our prayers (ver. 50).

16. Vers. 48-66. *Prayer of the innocent and persecuted man for help against his enemies.* 1. Description of the wanton oppression of his enemies and the heart-felt lamentation of the oppressed (vers. 48-54). 2. Whither this one had turned himself [for help] in this difficulty. (Vers. 55-58: "We, who had been cast, as it were, into the pit of destruction and the abyss of terror and distress, knew not whither to betake ourselves, except unto Thee alone, O Lord! We called upon Thee out of our anguished hearts, and Thou didst hear us. Since Thou hast begun to hear, hide not now Thine ears from our sighs and our cries.") 3. Prayer, that God will not let the wickedness of his enemies go unrevenged. (Vers. 59-66: "With Thee, truly, O Lord, I have nothing to say, because one cannot answer Thee for one thing of a thousand. But this we commend to Thee, O Lord, as the Righteous Judge, that our enemies, without any justifying cause, have tyrannized over us so grievously. Thou hearest also their reproach, which is uttered not only against us, but much more against Thy holy name. Because they will not cease from this outrageous insolence, do Thou then set about to requite them, as they have deserved. Let their heart be terrified, that is now defiant; let them feel Thy curse, which now they despise"). Fifth Sermon of EGID. HUNNIUS on the 3d chap. of Lamentations.

CHAPTER IV.

ZION'S GUILT AND PUNISHMENT GRAPHICALLY DESCRIBED BY AN EYE-WITNESS, [OR THE SUFFERINGS OF THE PEOPLE OF ALL GRADES AND RANKS OF SOCIETY.—W. H. H.]

The Song consists plainly of four parts [or sections], vers. 1-6; 7-11; 12-16; 17-20; and a conclusion, vers. 21, 22.

PART I. VERS. 1-11.

SECT. I. VERS. 1-6.

- ⌘ VER. 1. How doth gold become dim!
 The choice gold change its color!
 The hallowed stones are cast forth
 At the head of every street.
- ⌚ VER. 2. The noble sons of Zion,
 Who are equal in value to the purest gold,
 How are they esteemed as earthen pitchers,
 The work of the hands of the Potter!
- ⌚ VER. 3. Even jackals drew out the breasts,
 They suckled their whelps.
 The daughter of my people became cruel,
 Like ostriches in the wilderness.
- ⌚ VER. 4. The tongue of the sucking babe cleaved
 To the roof of his mouth for thirst:
 Young children asked bread.
 There was no one to break to them.
- ⌚ VER. 5. They that fed on dainties
 Perished on the streets:
 They that were borne on scarlet
 Embraced heaps-of-dirt.
- ⌚ VER. 6. For greater was the iniquity of the daughter of my people
 Than the sin of Sodom,
 Which was overthrown as in a moment
 And no hands came against her.

SEC. II. VERS. 7-11.

- ⌚ VER. 7. Her princes were purer than snow,
 Whiter than milk,
 They were more ruddy in body than corals;
 Their form—a sapphire.
- ⌚ VER. 8. Their visage became darker than blackness:
 They were not known in the streets:
 Their skin cleaved to their bones,
 It became dry like a stick.
- ⌚ VER. 9. Happier were those slain by the sword
 Than these slain by famine,
 Those pierced-ones, whose lives gushed forth
 While yet there were fruits of the field.
- ⌚ VER. 10. The hands of tender-hearted women
 Cooked their own children;
 They became food for them
 In the ruin of the daughter of my people.

VER. 11. Jehovah fulfilled His fury ;
He poured out His fierce wrath.
And He kindled a fire in Zion,
And it consumed her foundations.

ANALYSIS.

[The first elegy related especially to the city of Jerusalem ; the second, to Zion and the holy places ; the third, to the sufferings of the prophet, as a representative of the spiritual Israel ; this fourth elegy, relates to the sufferings of the people generally, embracing all classes.—W. H. H.]

The two parts, comprising the first-half of the chapter, vers. 1—6, 7—11, correspond with each other, both in matter and form. In the first part, vers. 1—6, is described the sad fate of the sons of Zion, noble scions of the noblest lineage (Jer. ii. 21). A contrast is presented, not only between their great worth and their pitiable fortune, but also between the fate that befell them, who constituted the living treasure of Zion, and the fate of its material wealth, vers. 1, 2. Then is described the harrowing grief, caused by the sufferings of little children, which could not possibly be relieved, vers. 3—5. Finally this part closes with the general remark, that Zion's guilt, if inferred from these facts, had been even greater than Sodom's, ver. 6.

In the second part, vers. 7—11, the Poet first describes the noble appearance and character of the Princes of Judah, and then, in striking contrast, the frightful wrongs they had endured, vers. 7—9 ; a description which evidently constitutes a parallel to that contained in vers. 1, 2. So, also, parallel to what was said of the children in vers. 3—5, is what we read on the same subject in ver. 10 ; only what is here said in ver. 10, constitutes a climax to what was related in vers. 3—5. The second part, like the first, ends with a general remark ; Zion has suffered the full measure of Divine wrath, ver. 11.

IV. 1, 2.

1 How is the gold become dim ! how is the most fine gold changed ! the stones of
2 the sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street. The precious sons of Zion, comparable to fine gold, how are they esteemed as earthen pitchers, the work of the hands of the potter !

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 1. יָקָרָה, see i. 1. יָקָרָה, Hophal only here ; elsewhere only Kal occurs, and that only twice, Ez. xxviii. 3 ; xxxi. 8. If the signification of יָקָרָה, demanded by the context in Ez. xxviii. 3, is *latere*,—and in xxxi. 8, is *obscurare*, then it naturally follows that the signification of the Hophal here is *obscurari* ; though it is not yet clearly apparent how this meaning agrees with the idea of *accumulation* (Sammeln), which lies in the words יָקָרָה יָקָרָה. [HENDERSON ; “יָקָרָה” to *congregate*, Arabic, *teẓit, obstruizit*, as clouds, when collected, do the heavens ; hence to *grow*, or *make dark*, obscure the lustre of anything. LXX *ἐμαυρωθη*.]—יָשָׁה. With respect to its Aramaic form, see iii. 12 ; 2 Kings xxv. 29 ; Eccl. viii. 11. [BLATNEY : “Twenty-five MSS. and one edition read יָשָׁה.”] The word has the signification of *altum, diversum esse*,—*mutari*,—only in later Hebrew, Esth. i. 7 ; iii. 8 ; Mal. iii. 6 ; and that in accordance with the Chaldaic, which often uses יָשָׁה in this sense, Dan. iii. 27 ; v. 9 ; vi. 18.—יָקָרָה, is not found in Jer. ; it stands in parallelism with יָקָרָה in Job xxxi. 24 ; Prov. xxv. 12 ; it is used with יָקָרָה, Cant. v. 11. [The Sept. have ἀργύριον, not because they read יָקָרָה, but because they were unwilling to repeat the word *gold*. ROSENUELLER.]

Ver. 2. יָקָרָה. In Jer. only in xv. 19.—סָלָה only here. The expression seems to be taken from Job xxviii. 16, 19, where we read of wisdom יָקָרָה סָלָה. סָלָה (סָלָה) is *tollere, pendere*. [Jerome translates *amicti auro*, which CALVIN prefers. “The value, and not the appearance is evidently meant,” (OWEN) ; it is the explanation of יָקָרָה, *precious*.—W. H. H.]—יָקָרָה from יָקָרָה, *secernere, purgare*, does not occur in Jer. ; yet see x. 9. The article generalizes the meaning.—Jer. never uses the Niphal יָקָרָה. יָקָרָה, Jer. xiii. 12 ; xlviii. 12.—יָקָרָה, Jer. xix. 1 ; xxxii. 14. The construction with יָקָרָה, as Is. xxix. 17 ; Ps. cvi. 31. Elsewhere, after יָקָרָה that with which the comparison is made is indicated by יָקָרָה, or the simple nominative.—יָקָרָה, frequent in Jer. x. 16 ; xviii. 2, 3, 4 ; xix. 1, 11 ; etc. [No occasional use of a new word can invalidate the presumption created by the use of the image of a potter's vessel, that Jeremiah was the author of this poem.—W. H. H.]—The expression יָקָרָה occurs here only.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **How.** That this song also begins with this exclamation (יָקָרָה) is a strong argument for the identity of the author. It is in the highest degree improbable that different authors not only composed alphabetical songs on the same subject, but also began them with the very same word. **How is the gold become dim !**

how is the most fine gold changed ! *How may gold become black, the precious treasure change its color ?* The correct understanding of this verse depends on the understanding of the next verse and its relation to this verse. THENIUS would substitute in ver. 2, *houses of Zion* for *sons of Zion* (יָקָרָה instead of יָקָרָה). Without dwelling on the fact, that not the least critical evidence for such a change of the text is offered, the context affords sufficient evidence against it : for

not only would *houses equal in value to gold* be an exaggerated hyperbole, but it is evident from the antithesis involved in the expression *the work of the hands of the potter*, and also from the subject of the parallel verses 7-9, that *men* are intended. But if we retain the reading *sons of Zion*, and if the meaning is that the *sons of Zion*, regarded as *precious*, are *equal in value* [comparable] to *gold*, then it is obvious in what sense *gold* and *precious stones* are spoken of in ver. 1. It is not of the fate of the Temple-gold and Temple-walls that he speaks [CALVIN, BOOTHROYD, NOYES, and seemingly WORDSWORTH]; but the Poet asks how is it possible that noble gold should lose its brightness, that the precious stones should be thrown upon the street? Thus, says he, has it happened to the *sons of Zion*, who are such jewels. And thus, what never happened in the case of material treasures and jewels, has occurred in the case of these living, metaphorical jewels. We take, then, ver. 1, as a question, relating to what was likely to happen according to the usual course of things. This is involved in the use of the imperfect tense in the Hebrew verbs [עָנַי, etc.], which refer to matters not yet completed as, *it was becoming dim or obscured*, etc. In any other sense the perfect tense would have been necessary. Nor can these imperfects be referred to the work of destruction while in course of execution (THENIUS); for it would certainly be very singular to represent the Jews as saying, whilst the work of destruction was going on, "How is now the gold in the Temple blackened by the smoke! How now are the stones of the Temple-wall rolled down!" Those, over whose heads everything was going to pieces, could not be thinking of such minute and particular details as these. Rather, in the form of a question, what had never before been known to happen, is here affirmed. [The form is interrogative, only so far as the interjection of surprise suggests a question as to the possibility of an event, else unparalleled. The construction is the same as in i. 1, *How sitteth solitary the city that, etc.*! So here, *How doth gold become dim*! That the reference is to *men*, and not to literal *gold* and *jewels*, is the opinion of BLAYNEY, HENDERSON, ROSENUELLER, GERLACH and others. GERLACH: "Since the chapter contains not one word (unless here) of the destruction and robbery of the Temple and palaces, but describes especially what befell the men, rather than the edifices of the city, (which latter theme had already been exhaustively discussed in chap. ii.), therefore the first verse must not be taken literally and explained of the Temple and its ornaments (Chald., MAURER, KALKAR, THENIUS; see i. 10). It is rather to be taken figuratively, either generally of the fall of all that was high and valuable in Israel, of which particular instances are cited in what follows, or, as MICHAELIS and ROSENUELLER have preferred, specifically, as explained by the following verse, which interprets the *gold* and *holy stones* of ver. 1, by the *sons of Zion*, whilst the words are thrown down at all the street-corners, find their explanation in the more detailed description of ver. 5. Besides, this designation of the *sons of Zion* as *stones of holiness* (אֲבָנֵי-קֹדֶשׁ), has an analogy in the *stones of a crown* (אֲבָנֵי-יָמָר, *precious stones*) in Zech. ix.

16. From this it appears, how unauthorized is the presumption (MICHAELIS, ROSENUELLER), which would perceive in the expression, *stones of holiness*, a reference to the stones on the breast-plate of the High Priest and, therefore, a designation of the Priests (whilst the *gold* denotes the people generally, and the *precious ore* [fine gold] the Princes), or would understand the words *stones of holiness* as referring directly to the stones on the breast-plate of the High Priest (MAURER [NOYES], see BELLERMANN, *Urim u. Thum*, s. 21. 'With the Israelites, thrown about dead on the streets, on account of their sins,—the holy stones—regarded as symbols of the people—will, at the same time, be scattered about at the corners of the streets.') The literal interpretation of the *stones* as the stones of the walls of the Sanctuary, by THENIUS and NEUMANN, [CALVIN, BOOTHROYD, etc.], (in which case the words should be אֲבָנֵי-הָקֶרֶת), is controverted by the improbability of their being scattered about through all the streets of the city,—an opinion, which is not made more acceptable by the conjecture of THENIUS, that all the streets of the city terminated near the Temple in an open square, for in any case the expression would then be very strongly hyperbolic."—W. H. H.]—**Become dim.**—The signification of the verb (עָנַי, *obscurari*), is to be taken, not in the sense of a momentary effect, but of a continuous obscuration. For not a superficial and transient, but a deep and abiding deprecation is affirmed in ver. 2, of the gold-like sons of Zion. What is said, then, is this, How can gold lose its bright lustre, and become dull, tarnished, black?—[**How.** The repetition of the *how* in the English version is as unnecessary here as in i. 1.—**The most fine gold.**—The Hebrew word for *gold* here is not the same Hebrew word used in the preceding clause. BROUGHTON has supplied the lack of an English equivalent by retaining the Hebrew word: *How is the gold dimmed! how is the pure ethereal changed!* The Hebrew word (פָּתָח) has been variously derived and interpreted. Three explanations have received the sanction of high authority (see LANGE's *Comm.*, Cant. v. 11). It has been derived from פָּתַח, to *hide*, to *hoard*, hence esteemed *precious*. So BARNES, Job xxxi. 24. Dr. NAGELSACH seems to adopt this sense. The English version also by using the superlative *most fine gold*. But if the word itself meant *precious gold*, the addition of the adjective לוֹב, *good*, would be superfluous. It has been derived, again, from פָּתַח in the supposed sense of *being solid, dense*, hence *massive gold*: so BLAYNEY, the *best massy gold*. Others derive it from פָּתַח=רָשַׁם, to *shine*, to *glitter*, and explain it of some very valuable kind of metal like gold (so GERLACH the *costly ore*, or *metal*, Erz); or of a particular kind of gold that shines and sparkles, *genus auri fulgentis*, a *micando* (FÜRST's *Concordance*). This last meaning seems to agree best with the sense here, the use of the word in Cant. v. 11, and the very peculiar use of the verb in Jer. ii. 22. According to ROSENUELLER, Chaldeans rendered it יָאֵר, *splendor*, the Syriac and JEROME, *color*.—**Changed, faded or changed its color.** GERLACH: "This can only denote a change of color, or loss of brightness, since

the gold could not be changed in its substance." W. H. H.]—**The stones of the Sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street.**

Thrown down are the stones of the sanctuary [stones of holiness, or consecrated stones] at the corners of all the streets. The expression *stones of the sanctuary* (אֲבָנֵי קֹדֶשׁ), is found only here. By itself it might properly denote the stones of the Temple walls, particularly since these are also called *costly stones* (אֲבָנִים יְקָרֹת), 1 Kings v. 31 (17); vii. 9-11. But who would take the trouble to carry these away and pour them out in the corners of the streets? What THENIUS says of the concentration of the principal streets at the foot of the Temple hill, is very problematical. Besides, the connection requires the sense of *precious stones*: for with such, not with wall-stones, however excellent, are the Sons of Zion compared as *precious* (יְקָרִים), and *precious stones* (אֲבָנֵי יְקָרָה), are often named, as here, in connection with gold, 2 Sam. xii. 30; 1 Kings x. 2, 10, 11. In regard to the use of precious stones in the Sanctuary, they were not only attached to the garments of the High Priest (Ex. xxviii. 9, 17-20; xxxix. 6, 10-13), but they were employed for ornamenting the Temple itself (2 Chron. iii. 6; 1 Chron. xxix. 2). Who would pour out such valuable stones in the corners of all the streets, that is to say, in the first corner one happened to come to? Even the enemy did not do that. Yet this thing happened to the sons of Zion though they were most precious jewels.

Ver. 2. **The precious sons of Zion**,—*Zion's sons, the noble ones* (בְּנוֹת יְקָרִים), comp. בְּנוֹת יְקָרִים, *honorable women*, Ps. xlv. 10 (9)). That we are to understand here by the *sons of Zion*, the nobility of the people [CALVIN, HENDERSON], I do not believe. The expression is too comprehensive, and nothing prevents our understanding the following predicates of the chosen people generally,* who

* [GERLACH would narrow the meaning down to the *little children* referred to vers. 3, 4, and explains their being called

were in their totality a *kingdom of priests* (Ex. xix. 6). The Princes are spoken of for the first time in the second part, vers. 7-11, which constitutes throughout the climax of the first part.

—**Comparable to fine gold, who are equal in value to gold** [lit., *those who are weighed with pure gold*. HENDERSON: "As what is weighed is estimated according to the contents of the opposite scale, the verb came to be employed in the sense of comparing one thing with another. Comp. Job xxviii. 16, 19."]—**Fine gold**, זָהָב, is *pure, solid gold*. [This is still another Hebrew word for gold, indicating its quality. BROUGHTON anglicizes it, *Fesse ore*, as he does בִּרְהַם in ver. 1, which he calls *cethern*. BLAYNEY: *the purest gold*.—W. H. H.] They are estimated by the gold, that is to say, their value is represented by a mass of gold, the weight of which is equal to their own. The expression is figurative.—**How**. [The repetition of this word יִכָּהֵם is forcible. It serves to connect this verse with ver. 1, and to continue and complete the sentence begun with the same word in ver. 1. It shows that one idea of horror and amazement pervades the whole sentence, and hence that the *gold, choice gold, and hallowed stones*, of ver. 1, are identical with the *precious sons of Zion*, in ver. 2.—W. H. H.]—**Are they esteemed as earthen pitchers—potsherd-pitchers—the work of the hands of the potter!** [WORDSWORTH: "As Jeremiah himself had represented them to be shattered in pieces for their sins, xix. 10. 11." GATAKER: "As bottles of sherd, or earthen stuff, so Jer. xix. 1, 10; as things of no repute or worth, 2 Cor. iv. 7. See Jer. xxii. 28." GERLACH: "The point of comparison is the worthlessness of the material out of which they are made, see Is. xlv. 9."]

precious, comparable to gold, by passages in which children are represented as of more value than any other gift of God, Gen. xv. 2; xxx. 1; Ps. cxxvii. 3. There is no necessity for this. It is much more natural to take these two introductory verses as embracing a general description of the humiliation of the whole people. The verses that follow give us the details of the picture, with reference to particular classes of people.—W. H. H.]

IV. 3-5.

3 Even the sea-monsters draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones :
4 the daughter of my people is become cruel, like the ostriches in the wilderness. The
tongue of the sucking child cleaveth to the roof of his mouth for thirst; the young
5 children ask bread, and no man breaketh it unto them. They that did feed delicately
are desolate in the streets; they that were brought up in scarlet embrace
dung-hills.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 3.—[רִמְיָן (K'ri, רִמְיָן). *Sea-monsters*, E. V., BOOTHROYD: *sea-calves*, E. V. marg.: *dragons*, BROUGHTON, BLAYNEY, OWEN; *serpent*, CALVIN; *jackals*, HENDERSON, NOYES, FUERST, *Lex.*: *wolves*, GERLACH: *wild-dogs*, THENIUS.]—חָלָה, never used in Jeremiah, is used of pulling off the shoe, in Deut. xxv. 9, 10; Is. xx. 2. The sense of *drawing*, seems to lie at the foundation of this root (see Hos. v. 6). Whether a second root חָלָה (from which comes חָלָה, *one equipped, a warrior*) may be affirmed, or whether the original identity of both may be established, we cannot now stop to inquire.—שָׁד, *mamma*, Jeremiah never uses [because he never had occasion to speak of the female breasts or teats.—W. H. H.].—Of the verb יָנַק, Jeremiah uses only once the Participle יֹנֵק, xlv. 7, in a substantive sense. [The only time Jeremiah in his prophecies had occasion to speak of a *suckling*, or make any allusion to a mother's nursing a child at the breast, he uses the participle of

the verb **נִקַּח**. What verb then would Jeremiah have been more likely to use in this place?—W. H. H.].—**נָגַר**, *young-one* [*whelp*], is found once in Jeremiah, in the form **נָגַר**, li. 38, see Nah. ii. 13.—**בֶּת-עֵמִי**. See ii. 11; iii. 48.—**לְאֶחָבִיר**. The verb to be or become must be supplied. See EWALD, § 217 d, a. **אֶחָבִיר** (Jeremiah uses only **אֶחָבִיר**, vi. 23; xxx. 14; i. 42) is the *cruel one*, Job xxx. 21. We would expect the feminine form: but that is never used, and, besides, the masculine form seems intended to convey the idea of *unwomanly*, *unmotherly*; it is as if it were said, Zion has become a hardened man.—**כִּי יִנְיָם**. The Masorites connect the two words and read **כִּי יִנְיָם**. It is true that **יִנְיָ** occurs only here (elsewhere the ostrich is called **בֶּת-יִנְיָ**, the daughter of screeching, Mic. i. 8; Job. xxx. 29, etc.). Yet the K'ti is to be approved of. For, on the one hand, the separation could easily happen by mistake; and, on the other hand, **יִנְיָ**, as the K'tib has it, gives no satisfactory sense. It must be translated, *For criers* (Heuler) *in the wilderness* (are they.) To supply **הִנֵּה** here is difficult, and who are the criers in the wilderness? The children, or (as others prefer) their parents? [Forty-five of KENNICOTT's MSS., and seventy-seven of DE ROSSI's, and most of the early printed editions of the 15th century, according to HENDERSON and GERLACH, have **כִּי יִנְיָם**, without any reference to another reading, "NEUMANN, in support of the K'tib, would understand by the *crying ones* (Heulenden) the *wild beasts* of the wilderness, as the Venetian Greek, *ὡς σερῳήνες*" (GERLACH).—W. H. H.]

Ver. 4.—**וְכָבֵד**. The same phrase is found in Job xxix. 10; Ps. cxxviii. 6; comp. xxii. 16 (15); Ez. iii. 26, where **אֵל** is used.—Jeremiah uses **חָךְ** never [because he never had occasion to, not happening ever to speak of the *palate*, or *roof of the mouth*.—W. H. H.]. **כָּבֵד** twice, xlii. 11; xlii. 16: **יִנְיָ** once, xlv. 7: **נָגַר** frequently, v. 15; ix. 2, 4, 7, etc.: **צִבְיָה** once for **צִבְיָה**, xlvi. 18.—**יְעֹלִילִים**. See i. 5; ii. 19; Jer. vi. 11; ix. 20 (21). **פָּרֵשׁ**, a scribal variety for **פָּרִים**, as Mic. iii. 3; see Is. lviii. 7; Jer. xvi. 7.

Ver. 5.—**אֶחָבִיר** is frequently constructed with **לְ** (Ex. xii. 43-45; Lev. ii. 11; Jud. xiii. 16), but nowhere except here with **לְ**. BÖTTCHER urges the **לְ**, and translates *admitted to dainties*, or *directed to dainties* (**לְ** having a *local* sense, as 2 Sam. ix. 7, or Job xii. 8. See THENIUS). THENIUS supposes the allusion to be rather to the external surroundings of delicate food, than to the food itself. But it is not apparent how **אֶחָבִיר** can mean to *admit*, to *direct*, or how **לְ** can denote *something around*. If **לְ** is to be explained as a Hebraism, then we must adopt a pregnant construction, and regard **לְ** as dependent on an omitted verb of *craving after*, *longing for*. See Prov. xxiii. 3, 6, **אֶל-תִּהְיוּ לִמְטַעֲפוֹתַי**, comp. xxiv. 1. To *eat after dainties* would, then, be the same as seeking to eat such. Our book, however, was written at a time when an Aramaic expression cannot surprise us. Besides, there is found in Jeremiah an undoubted example of this Aramaic **לְ**, as a *nota accusativi*, xl. 2. [Note this as a mark of Jeremiah authorship, that is a set-off, at least, against many of the trivial exceptions to his style.—W. H. H.] See EWALD, § 277, e. [GESENIUS *Gr.*, § 151, e. "It is a solecism of the later style, when active verbs are construed with **לְ**, instead of the accusative, as **לְ** **אָכַל**, Lam. iv. 5."—GERLACH takes the whole expression adverbially, nach Herzenslust assen, they ate according to their heart's desire.—W. H. H.].—**מִעֵינֵי**. See Gen. xlix. 20; 1 Sam. xv. 32; Prov. xxix. 17. **כְּעֵרְבִי**, Jer. ii. 34, is composed of **כֵּן** and **עֵרְבִי** (Ps. xxxvi. 9 (8); 2 Sam. i. 24.—**נִשְׁמַעַנָּה**. See Jer. iv. 9; Ez. iv. 17, where the word is used as here of persons.—**אֶבֶן** is the technical word for the nurture of children: see **אֶבֶן**, Num. xi. 12; Is. xlix. 23; 2 Kings x. 1, 5; Esth. ii. 7: **אֶבֶן**, Ruth iv. 16; 2 Sam. iv. 4. The fundamental meaning seems to be to *carry*, *support*, *raise up*; see **אֶבֶן** a *column*, **אֶבֶן**, **אֶבֶן**, the one who erects a building, the architect. **אֶבֶן** are then *gestati*, see Is. ix. 4. Jeremiah uses Niphal, xv. 18; xlii. 5, and Hiphil, xli. 6; xl. 14, but only in an ethical sense.—**הוֹלֵךְ** does not occur in Jeremiah.—The word **אֶשְׁפֹּתוֹת** occurs only here. The plural **אֶשְׁפֹּתוֹת** in 1 Sam. ii. 8; Ps. cxlii. 7; Neh. ii. 13; iii. 13, 14; xii. 31. The signification is undoubtedly *dirt* (Koth). For its derivation, see EWALD, § 186, e; OLSH., § 211, a.—The verb **חָבַק**, Jeremiah uses in no form. Piel is to *embrace*.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3. Vers. 1, 2, describe the misfortunes of Zion from a theocratic point of view; vers. 3-5 show how terrible they were, as seen from a natural point of view, by describing the pitiable misery of the poor children: see i. 5; ii. 11, 12, 19, 20. **Even the sea-monsters** (marg. *sea-calves*) [*jackals*, or *wolves*] **draw out [drew-out] the breast, they give [gave] suck to their young ones**. That the Hebrew word translated *sea-monsters*, **תַּיִךְ**, here stands for **תַּיִךְ** = *jackals* (see Jer. ix. 10 (11); x. 22; xiv. 6, etc.), was an opinion of the Masorites, which many of the moderns have adopted from the Syriac. In fact, **תַּיִךְ** is the Aramaic plural ending (see Olsh. § 111 b), which would not be surprising here. **תַּיִךְ**, as a singular (see Jer. li. 34) is *bellua maritima* (see Gen. i. 21), which is defined at one time as a *dragon*, at another as

a *whale*, at another as a *crocodile*, at another as a *serpent* (comp. Ex. vii. 9, 10; Deut. xxxii. 23; Ps. lxxiv. 13, etc.). That the sea-monsters draw out for use the teats, which are contained in the breasts as in bags or sheaths, BOCHART (in the *Hieroicoicon*, tom. iii. p. 777, ed. Rosenmüller) authenticates, by many evidences, as a fact known to the ancients. There is on this account, therefore, no reason for departing from the sense indicated by the text. [There are, however, several other reasons for regarding this word as an Aramaic plural for *jackals* or for *wolves* (GERLACH), which belong to the same family. These are, 1. The plural forms of the verbs (*drew out*, *gave suck*) and of the suffix (*their young-ones*), which would require **תַּיִךְ** instead of **תַּיִךְ**, if *sea-monsters* were intended. 2. The fact that **נָגַר** is used of the whelps of lions, bears, dogs, and animals of similar species. 3. The authority of the Masorites. 4. The frequent occurrence of Aramaic forms in Jeremiah's writings. 5. The agreement of so many versions and commenta-

tors, ancient and modern. 6. The probability that jackals, wolves, or animals of that description, would occur to the mind of the Prophet in connection with the events of which he speaks. There was nothing to suggest the *monsters of the deep*, and the comparison, if referred to them, seems forced and far-fetched. But as the Prophet recalls the consequences of the destruction of Jerusalem, as he remembers how the *foxes* even now had possession of the *mountain of Zion*, v. 18, he cannot forget how hungry beasts of prey had revelled in the land, and prowled about the deserted villages and even the streets of Jerusalem itself. Even those beasts had shown the instincts of natural affection at least. And hence the natural contrast between them and the mothers, who, before the beasts appeared on the scene, forsook their own babes and refused to give them nourishment. It should be observed here that the verbs in this verse and in all the following description are in the past time. The Prophet is describing what had happened; not what was then transpiring. This use of the perfect tense shows that he was referring, not in the abstract, to what it is in the nature of jackals to do, but in the concrete, to what had been actually observed of them. Even (the **Q** is emphatic) jackals, that infested the depopulated country, drew out their breast, etc.—The expression *drawing out the breast* is suggested by the common habit of women in drawing out the breast from the covering robe and presenting it to the child; *a mulieribus lactantibus, quæ laxata veste mammas lactanti præbent* (JUNIUS, quoted by GERLACH).—W. H. H.]—**The daughter of my people is become cruel**, [*became cruel*. Lit. *was turned into a cruel one* (GATAKER), see Job xxx. 21. CALVIN says: “The daughter of my people is come to the cruel one, for the people had to do with nothing but cruelty, . . . He, then, does not accuse the people of cruelty, that they did not nourish their children, but on the contrary, he means that they were given up to cruel enemies.” But the preceding part of this verse and what follows in vers. 4, 5, and especially in the climax presented in ver. 10, require the sense given in our English version, in which the versions agree with great unanimity. The Prophet gives us a frightful instance of the effect of suffering and starvation. Mothers became more unnatural than jackals or hyenas that suckle their young; and forsook their babes, not merely to avoid the sight of pains they could not alleviate, but to escape the exhausting demands upon their own waning strength,—nay, the mania induced by extreme suffering destroyed their affection for their children.—W. H. H.]—**Like the ostriches in the wilderness**. In reference to the want of feeling towards its young in the ostrich, THENIUS refers to OKEN’s *Natural History* (vii. s. 655, ff.). See BOCHART, *Hieroz.* P. II. L. II. cap. 14, pag. 824; cap. 17, pag. 854 seqq. ed. ROSENEM.—WINTER R. W. B. s. v.

Strauss. Job xxxix. 13-17. [“On the least noise or trivial occasion she forsakes her eggs or her young ones, to which perhaps she never returns; or if she does, it may be too late either to restore life to the one, or to preserve the lives of the others. Agreeably to this account, the Arabs meet sometimes with whole nests of these eggs undisturbed; some of them are sweet and good, others are addled and corrupted; others again have their young ones of different growth, according to the time, it may be presumed, they may have been forsaken of the dam. They often meet with a few of the little ones no bigger than well-grown pullets, half-starved, straggling, and moaning about, like so many distressed orphans, for their mother.” (SHAW’S *Travels*, quoted by NOYES). “The Arabs call the ostrich the *impious* or *ungodly* bird, on account of its neglect and cruelty towards its young,” (BARNES on Job xxxix. 13).]

Ver. 4. **The tongue of the sucking child cleaveth [cleaved] to the roof of his mouth for thirst**. See Job xxix. 10; Ps. cxxxvii. 6, comp. xxii. 16 (15); Ez. iii. 26.—**Young children ask [asked] bread [see ii. 11, 12], and no man breaketh it unto them [and there was no one to break to them]**.

Ver. 5. **They that did feed delicately, they that ate dainties [or, fed on dainties, CALVIN, BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, NOYES].—Are desolate in the streets, perish [perished] on the streets, [i. e. by starvation, while seeking in vain for food.—W. H. H.].—They that were brought up in scarlet, they who were carried on crimson [carried on cloths, or borne on couches of scarlet, crimson, or purple color, made of costly materials of Tyrian dyes.—W. H. H.]. Scarlet, the red dying material, got from the cochineal worm; see Ex. xvi. 20; Is. i. 18.—Embrace dunghills, embrace the dirt [embraced dirt-heaps, the heaps of dirt, refuse (rubbish, FUERST’S *Lex.*), lying in the streets of the city.—W. H. H.]. To embrace the dirt (see Job xxiv. 8, *embrace the rock*) can only mean to have it between the arms, which is done by them who lie in the dirt. *Sterquilinea arripiunt, et super ea veluti toto corpore incumbunt, ut fame confecti cibum inde eruant*. (They eagerly grasp the dunghills, stretched out upon them, as it were at full length, that, dying of hunger, they may thence seize their food).—PAREAU. [The idea of seeking food in the dirt—heaps of the city streets, confuses the two very distinct members of this verse. Little children, who had been fed on delicacies, perished in the streets while vainly seeking food; and thus, those, who had been borne on costly couches covered with the richest goods, lay now dying, with outstretched hands embracing, as it were, the heaps of filth in the city streets. To embrace the dust is a familiar image in all languages: to embrace the dirt—heaps of an oriental city, so proverbially filthy, intensifies the figure. The whole description is highly poetical.—W. H. H.]**

IV. 6.

- 6 For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed on her.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 6. The expression הַפְּנִיכָה is taken from Gen. xix. 25 (וַיִּפְּנֵךְ אֶת-הָעָרִים), comp. Jer. xx. 16, and כְּמַהֲפֹכֶת, Deut. xxix. 22; Is. xiii. 19; Am. iv. 11; Jer. l. 40). חָלוּ is derived, not from חוּל, but from חָלָה (so derived apparently by the Sept. and Syr.). The latter denotes *to relax, to be powerless*, Judg. xvi. 7; Is. lvii. 10; it can also very well be said of the hands, and there is no necessity of resorting, by any artificial method, to a modification of the idea of *gyrate*. In reference to this word, see Jer. v. 3. Jer. uses the Kal of נָחַל, v. 27, and the Hiphil, xlviii. 26, 42.—עוֹן is frequent with him, ii. 22; iii. 13; xiii. 22; etc.—בַּת-עַמִּי, see ii. 11.—הַטָּאָה often in Jer. xvi. 10; xvii. 13; etc.—הָנֵעַ also, iv. 20; xviii. 7, 9.—כְּמֹרְגֵנֶּעַ occurs only here; yet see כְּרִנֵּעַ Num. xvi. 21; xvii. 10; Ps. xiii. 19.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. With this verse the Poet concludes the first part of his Song. This verse corresponds to ver. 11, which constitutes a similar conclusion. In both cases the Poet draws a general inference from the preceding particular facts, which he had related in detail. In this verse the inference is, that the guilt of Zion was proved to be greater than the sin of Sodom.—**For the punishment of the iniquity (marg. For the iniquity) of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom.**—*And the guilt of the daughter of my people was greater than the sin of Sodom.* I cannot agree with those who take עוֹן and חַטָּאת in the sense of the *punishment* of sin. This sense is not capable of proof. In all the cases appealed to for this purpose (Gen. iv. 13; 1 Sam. xxviii. 10; 2 Sam. xvi. 12; Is. v. 18; Ps. xxxi. 11), on more exact examination, their original meaning of *sin, guilt*, appears to be their real meaning. And this is true in reference to חַטָּאת, for which some would justify the sense of *pœna peccati*, from the passages Num. xxxii. 23; Is. xl. 2; Zech. xiv. 9. See DRECHSLER on Is. v. 18. In וַיִּגְדֵּל = *was greater*, lies, then, the thought, it being allowable to infer the cause from the effect, that Zion's guilt is shown to be greater than was the sin-guiltiness (Sündenschuld) of Sodom. There is certainly in the vav before וַיִּגְדֵּל a causal intimation. For it amounts to the same thing, as far as the sense is concerned, whether I infer the effect from the cause with the words *and so*, or the cause from the effect with the word *for*. This causal use of the vav, moreover, is sufficiently established; see Ps. vii. 10; lx. 13; xcv. 5; Prov. xxiii. 3; Gen. xxii. 12; Jer. xvi. 12; xxiii. 36; xxxi. 3; Is. xxxix. 1; Hos. iv. 4; vi. 4; etc. See my Gr. § 110, 1. [The Vav coördinates the proposition with what precedes in the relation of cause to effect. These things were so, *for* the sin was greater, etc. As the vav is here the initial letter, the stress laid upon it shows the masterly manner in which the author of the poem often makes the acrostic, which in common hands would be constrained and merely artificial, contribute to

the spirit and force of the sentiment. This is true, whether we take the words discussed, in the sense of *sin* or the *punishment of sin*; but the fact that it is emphatic is an argument in favor of the sense in which Dr. NÆGELSBACH construes it, and this added to the doubt whether עוֹן and חַטָּאת ever do mean the *punishment* of sin, may decide us in favor of his translation. The other translation gives good sense and fits in admirably with the context, and is adopted without hesitation by all the English versions and commentators (except WORDSWORTH), and by CALVIN and GERLACH. Yet CALVIN says: "If any one prefers the other version, I will not contend, for it is not unsuitable; and hence also a most useful doctrine may be drawn, that we are to judge of the grievousness of our sins by the greatness of our punishment; for God never exceeds what is just when He takes vengeance on the sins of men. Then His severity shows how grievously men have sinned. Thus, Jeremiah may have reasoned from the effect to the cause, and declared that the people had been more wicked than the Sodomites. Nor is this unreasonable; for . . . the Prophets everywhere charged them as men who not only equalled but also surpassed the Sodomites, especially Ezekiel (xvi. 46, 47). Isaiah also called them the people of Gomorrah, and the king's counsellors and judges, the princes of Sodom (Is. i. 9, 10). This mode of speaking is then common in the Prophets, and the meaning is not unsuitable." The Sept. translates both words *avouia*; the Vulg. one *iniquitas*, the other *peccatum*.—W. H. H.].—**That was overthrown as in a moment.** Sodom's guilt was great, and the punishment decreed for it corresponded to the greatness of its sin: it was destroyed instantaneously by fire falling from Heaven (see Gen. xix. 25), whereby its punishment was proved to be supernatural and *divinitus immissa* [sent from God]. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God (Heb. x. 31). [BLAYNEY: "Sodom was destroyed by a sudden act of God, which the Prophet thinks preferable to lingering and wasting away with disease or want, as was the case in Jerusalem during the long siege."]—**And no hands stayed on her**—*and no hands became slack (relaxed) thereby.* That Sodom was destroyed, not by the hands of men, but by the hand of God

alone, is a fact that is emphasized as giving intensity to the severity of its punishment. Yet, our Poet would say, the fate of Jerusalem was still more terrible, because its guilt was greater than Sodom's. With what propriety this could be affirmed, is easily comprehended. For there had not been on the part of Sodom and Gomorrah such fulness of manifestation of the long-suffering love of God, as in the case of Jerusalem, (see Jer. vii. 13, 25; xi. 7; xxv. 4; Ez. xvi. 46-48; Is. i. 10; Matt. xi. 23, 24). But if it be asked, in what respect Jerusalem's fate had been more dreadful than that of Sodom, the answer, it seems to me, is contained in the *כְּמוֹתֶיךָ*—*as in a moment*. Sodom's sufferings in death were brief: *there were no starving children, no mothers who cooked their children*. Jerusalem's sufferings were long and protracted, whereby was produced that horrible crime! *Eversio Sodomæ fuit instar subitæ apoplexiæ, eversio autem Hierosolymæ fuit instar lentæ tabis* [the overthrow of Sodom was a kind of sudden apoplexy, but the overthrow of Jerusalem was a kind of slow consumption], says FÖRSTER [Dr. NÆGELSBACH has not made his sense of this difficult clause very apparent. It seems hardly credible that *כָּה* should mean *thereby* (dadurch). If the verb is derived from *חָלַה*, instead of *חָלָה*, the translation of either BLAYNEY or OWEN, is to be preferred. BLAYNEY translates *nor were hands weakened in her*, referring

to the suddenness of the destruction, and forming a parallelism with the preceding clause, *overthrown as in a moment*. OWEN translates, *and not wearied against (or over) her were hands*, and says, "This is substantially the Sept. and Syr. GROTIUS says that the meaning is, that Sodom was destroyed not by human means, that is, not by a siege as Jerusalem had been." WORDSWORTH: "*And no hands were weary on her*. No human hands were wearied by destroying her, but she was suddenly consumed by the hand of God." If we accept of the usual derivation of the verb from *חָלָה*, then the translation of THENIUS may be commended for its simplicity, and is supported by the dual form of *יָדַי*—*hands*, and *no one in her wrung the hands*. But, as GERLACH shows, the dual form is constantly used for the plural (see *כָּל-יָדַי*, *all hands*, Is. xiii. 7), and the verb *חָלָה* is used with *בְּ* of the object, of *brandishing the sword against the cities of Ephraim* (Hos. xi. 6): we may, therefore, understand the sense to be, *and no hands (i. e., human hands) were wrung round (or brandished) against it, men's hands were not brought against it*. This seems to correspond with Dr. NÆGELSBACH's interpretation, and is the sense generally adopted. BOOTHROYD: *Without the hands of men*. HENDERSON: *And no hands attacked her*. NOYES: *Though no hands came against her*.—W. H. H.]

IV. 7-9.

- 7 Her Nazarites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were
8 more ruddy in body than rubies, their polishing *was* of sapphire: Their visage is
blacker than a coal; they are not known in the streets; their skin cleaveth to their
9 bones; it is withered, it is become like a stick. *They that be slain with the sword*
are better than *they that be slain with hunger*: for these pine away, stricken through
for *want of* the fruits of the field.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 7.—*נָזִיר*. The word occurs only in Job xv. 15; xxv. 5; and in Hiph., Job ix. 30.—*נָזִיר* does not occur in Jeremiah. [Yet *נָזִיר*, Jer. vii. 29, is a remarkable coincidence in the use of language, if *נָזִירִים* means *crowned-ones*, as Dr. NÆGELSBACH suggests.—W. H. H.]—*שֶׁלֶג*. Jer. xviii. 14.—The verb *צָחַח*, *splenditum esse, nitere*, is found only here. The adjective *צָח* in Jer. iv. 11.—*חֹלֶב* in Jeremiah only in the phrase *וְיָבֵט חֹלֶב*, xi. 5; xxxii. 22.—*אֶדָם* is found only here. The sense without doubt is to be *red, reddish*. The same meaning adheres to the derived conjugations, Pual (Ex. xxv. 5, xxvi. 14; xxxv. 7, 23; Neh. ii. 4), Hiphil (Is. i. 18), Hithpaal (Is. i. 18). The word does not occur in Jeremiah.—*עֵצֶם* (in Jer. viii. 1: xx. 9; xxiii. 9) stands here as *pars pro toto*. See Prov. xv. 30; xvi. 24; and *יָצַם*, Ps. cxxxix. 15. [BLAYNEY absurdly translates, *They were ruddier on the bone*, and thus explains, "In the preceding line the whiteness of their skin is described; in this their flesh, which was red underneath towards the bone, marking their high health."]—*כִּפְּרִי* (see Ez. i. 26; x. 1) does not occur in Jeremiah.

Ver. 8.—*חֹשֶׁךְ*. Jeremiah uses the Hiphil, only once, xiii. 16.—*שָׁחֹר* occurs only here (see *שָׁחֹר*, Jer. ii. 18). [The translation of BLAYNEY, *duskier than the dawn*, and of HENDERSON, *darker than the dawn*, would require us to read *שָׁחֹר*, and then the comparison could only be with the darkness of the very early dawn, and would be an awkward figure at that.—W. H. H.]—*הָאֶדָם*. See Jer. xi. 16.—*נִכְרִי*, Niph. of *נָכַר*, see Prov. xxvi. 24; Job xxxiv. 19. In Jeremiah Piel is found, xix. 4, and Hiphil xxiv. 5.—*צָפַר*, *firmiter adherere*, only here.—*עוֹרֶם*, see iii. 4.—*וְיָבֵט וְנָגַהּ*, see Jos. ix. 5. In Jeremiah the verb *יָבֵט* is often found, xxiii. 10; i. 38, etc. The adjective *יָבֵט* he never uses.—*עֵץ* is frequent in Jeremiah, ii. 20; iii. 6, 9, 13, etc.

Ver. 9.—For the meaning of *טוֹבִים*, see iii. 26.—The expression *חֲלָל-חֶבֶר*, is found in Jer. xiv. 18, but is especially frequent with Ezekiel, xxxi. 17, 18; xxxii. 21-31.—*שֶׁ* *relativum*, see ii. 15.—*יָבֵט*. The word is found in Jeremiah only in

xlx. 4, and then in another sense. Here it must evidently denote the dissolving of life, *i. e.*, the lingering dying of the starving. The word does not, indeed, occur elsewhere in this sense, for everywhere else it stands for the virile flux or female menses, or for confluence or abundant flowing together (גִּלְגָּל, אֶרֶץ, Ex. iii. 8, *etc.*), or for copious water-floods (Ps. lxxviii. 20; cv. 41; Is. xlviii. 21). But the connection absolutely requires us to take the idea of *flowing*, which the word undoubtedly has, in this modification of it. PAREAU, also, with propriety, calls attention to the closely related word דָּאֵב, *tabescere* (Jer. xxxi. 12, 25, Ps. lxxxviii. 10). He also shows that in the Latin, a similar affinity exists between *tabescere* and *liquesce*. For as SENECA at one time says (Epist. 26) *incommodum summum est minus et deperire et, ut proprie dicam, liquesce*, so he says another time, (M-dea, ver. 590), *in rivos miribus solutis sole jam forti, mediocque vere tabuit Hamus*. [See critical notes below.]—יִרְקָרִים. Jeremiah uses the word twice, xxxvii. 10; li. 4, and both times the Part. Pual.—The expression הַנִּיבֹלָה is found in Dent. xxxii. 13; comp. Ez. xxxvi. 30; Is. xxvii. 6; Judg. ix. 11. הַנִּיבֹלָה does not occur in Jeremiah, but שָׁרִי does, iv. 17; xviii. 14. כֵּן, here, cannot possibly have the positive sense of *giving out, failure*, or that of positive causality. It must rather be taken in its negative sense, *away, far from, without*. See ver. 18; and Jer. xlviii. 45; Job xi. 15; xxi. 9. See my *Gr.*, § 112, 5 d.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 7-11. The plan of this part [which may be regarded as the antistrophe to vers. 1-6.—W. H. H.] is exactly similar to that of vers. 1-6. It begins with a description of what the *Princes of Zion* had to suffer. This description corresponds evidently to what was said generally of the *sons of Zion*, vers. 1, 2, of whom the Princes are the flower. But vers. 7-9 form a climax to vers. 1, 2, which appears in the fact that what is said of the *Princes of Zion*, in vers. 8, 9, surpasses what is said of the *sons of Zion* in the last clause of ver. 2. Ver. 10 corresponds in a similar way with vers. 3-5, what was said there, being surpassed here. Ver. 11, finally, corresponds with ver. 6; for like it, ver. 11 contains a definite, comprehensive and inferential conclusion.

Ver. 7. *Her Nazarites*—*her Princes*. That נְזִירִים here cannot denote the Nazarites is evident, not so much from the description which is given of them, for that would be very suitable to a Samson for instance, as from the fact that the Nazarites were a mere fraction of the whole people, too scattered and numerically insignificant to be mentioned here with such particularity. Rather as they [the Nazarites] were said to be *coronati, crowned ones*, from their unshorn hair

[see Num. vi. 19, הִתְנַחֲלוּ אֶת-נִירוֹ=his crown is shaven off of him; גִּזְרֵךְ, the unshorn hair, or crown, Jer. vii. 29.—W. H. H.], so the Poet here calls the Princes *crowned ones* [see נִיר, to encircle, hence נִיר, a crown, diadem or chaplet.—W. H. H.] from the golden crown which they wore. It is true this is a poetical expression, which is not of frequent occurrence; for we can only compare Gen. xlix. 26 (Dent. xxxiii. 16), where Joseph is called נִיר אֶחָד, the crowned one among his brothers. It is, besides, very apparent that the Poet was required to select a subject, to which the brilliant predicates, which he heaps up in ver. 7, would be appropriate. [GATAKER gives the same meaning and derivation to the word, and refers to Nah. iii. 17, כְּנִזְרֵיךְ, thy crowned ones, or honorable ones. It seems more likely, however, that the word designates Princes or nobles, not from any allusion to their being *crowned*, which is not obvious, but because they constituted a *separate* and *distinguished* class of persons, were set apart for honorable offices, as the Nazarites were for strictly religious services (*non voto sed dignitate*

separati; NOLDIUS, quoted by GERLACH). So CALVIN explains the word in Gen. xlix. 26, and BLAYNEY and GERLACH here. BOOTHROYD translates nobles. NOYES, princes. HENDERSON retains the word *Nazarites*.—W. H. H.]—*Were purer*—*more shining* [glistering, glänzender]. The word in Job xv. 15; xxv. 5, represents the brightness of the heavens and the stars.—*Than snow*. The comparison with the glistening white snow is found also in Ps. li. 9 (7); Is. i. 18.—*They were whiter than milk*. [Purer than snow, whiter than milk, according to ordinary Bible usage, are beautiful metaphors for innocence of character and life. Here, however, they refer entirely to physical appearance, the resplendent beauty of their complexion, as is plain from what follows: not of their garments, as some have imagined, but of their bodies, as is evident from the antithesis in the next verse.—W. H. H.]—*They were more ruddy in body than rubies* (Röthlicher strahlten sie am Leibe als Korallen), their body was of a more reddish hue than corals. "Red on white is the normal color of the human complexion, the prime-color of beauty, Cant. v. 10; Lam. iv. 7," says DELITZSCH, *Psychol.*, p. 75. [CALVIN, understanding Nazarites as intended, supposes that their red color was a mark and evidence of God's favor as in the cases of the Hebrew children recorded in Daniel. "We know that the Nazarites abstained from wine and strong drink: hence abstinence might have lessened somewhat of their ruddiness. For he who is accustomed to drink wine, if he abstains for a time, is apt to grow pale; he will then lose almost all his color, at least he will not be so ruddy; nor will there appear in his face and in his members so much vigor as when he took his ordinary support. Jeremiah, in short, teaches us that the blessing of God was conspicuous in the Nazarites, for He wonderfully supported them while they were for a time abstinent." This necessity of appealing to a possible miracle may itself create a doubt, if Nazarites are here referred to at all. That in such a corrupt state of society as existed, at that period of their history, among the Jews, there were many who assumed the vows of the Nazarite, is doubtful. There is no allusion to the existence even of Nazarites among the people at this time, in either the prophetic or historical books. But that there was not only such a class, but that they were so remarkable for their piety and so acceptable to God, that God gave them such evidences of His favor as were bestowed on Daniel

and his brethren, making them conspicuous among men by their personal beauty, especially by the ruddiness of their complexion, we cannot believe. And it would be incredible and horrible that upon that particular class the heaviest judgments descended, as is related in the next verse. If we infer from their personal beauty, in ver. 7, that they were special favorites of Heaven, we must conclude, from the transformation of their appearance into that of ugliness, in ver. 8, that they were also special objects of Divine wrath. The two things do not agree. This alone proves that Nazarites are not intended. The description of their personal appearance, which could only apply to Nazarites, by some such forced construction as requires CALVIN to invoke the aid of a miracle, is entirely appropriate to that class of the nobility represented by the Princes, who lived delicately and luxuriously, and whose faces, not embrowned by exposure to the weather, nor seamed and roughened by a life of hardship, were flushed and shining from the effects of high living, and whose persons beamed and glistened, as it were, from the care bestowed upon them, and the pains taken to beautify and adorn themselves. Perhaps the idea conveyed by the Hebrew verbs of the *glistening* quality of their white and red complexion, may be due to the then prevailing use of unguents.—W. H. H.]—**Rubies, corals,** רִבְיָנִים. Concerning this word, which occurs besides in Job xxviii. 18; Prov. iii. 15; viii. 11; xx. 15; xxxi. 10, opinions are much divided. The translations are entirely at variance: Sept. λίθοι, Symm. τὰ περιβλεπ-α, Chald. lapides pretiosi, Syr. sardinus, JEROME, *ebur antiquum*. Among the moderns, BOOTHUS (*animadv. ss.*, IV. 3), whom J. D. MICHAELIS, GESSENIUS, MAURER and THENIUS [HENDERSON, NOYES, GERLACH, FÜRST] follow, maintains the signification to be *corals*: against which BOCHART (*Hieroz.* P. ii., L. V., Cap. 6, 7, ed., ROSENTH., Tom. iii., pag. 601 seqq.) contends for *pearls*. His opinion is especially maintained by PAREAU (not on this passage, but in his remarks on Job xxviii.) and supported with new arguments. LEYER also (in Herz. R.-Enc. XI., p. 399) is inclined to adopt this side. The decision is difficult. *Corals* agree best with the context, since the existence of reddish pearls is too slightly established, and the meaning of *glistening* for the Hebrew רִבְיָנִים is entirely hypothetical.—**Their polishing was of sapphire,** a *sapphire* was their form.—**Their polishing, their form,** Ger. Gestalt; Fr. *taille*; Lat. *forma, figura* [Eng. *mien, general appearance*]. The word גִּיּוּר, from גִּיּוּר iii. 54) occurs in this sense only here. In the description of Ezekiel's temple it is used of the northern porch, xli. 12-15; xlii. 1, 10, 13. [BLAYNEY, after BRAUNUS (see Pictorial Bible), taking the word from גִּיּוּר to divide, or intersect, translates, *their veining was the sapphire*; alluding to the blue veins appearing through the white and red complexions. So BOOTHROYD and ADAM CLARKE. This would be either a mark of beauty, or an intimation of the bloated condition of the luxurious and pampered nobility. In either case, the sense is good, and is recommended by the fact that *snow, milk and corals* indicate *color*, and therefore *sapphire*, too, would naturally suggest

the characteristic color of that gem. גִּיּוּר, however, would more likely indicate the *cutting* of a gem, and hence its *form, taille*, and in case of the sapphire, which is next in hardness to the diamond, its brilliancy of appearance. GERLACH: "The words are not to be understood of color (as of the veins showing through, or of the garments, as Cant. xxviii. 18), but, on account of the characteristic גִּיּוּר, *excisio, taille*, of the perfect shape, the consummate beauty of bodily form (Körperbau). *Sapphire was their form* (Gestalt), that is to say, so beautiful and without fault, as if they were a polished image made out of precious stone."—W. H. H.] White as milk and snow, red as corals, and shining as sapphire, is the appearance of the nobles as here described. This seems to constitute a climax to vers. 1, 2: for the Poet evidently, in ver. 7, paints with gayer and more variegated colors.

Ver. 8. In glaring contrast with ver. 7, he now describes what has befallen the nobles in consequence of the great catastrophe.—**Their visage—their appearance** [so BLAYNEY, HENDERSON, OWEN, GERLACH: *their countenance*, NOYES: *their visage*, BROUGHTON, BOOTHROYD].—**Is** [was, or became]. The verbs are all in the past tense. So GATAKER and OWEN render them. The Prophet is still looking back to what had taken place, though now to a time posterior to that indicated in ver. 7. He is describing the change that took place in the appearance of the nobles, while the city was still standing, and they were seen in the streets.—W. H. H.] **Blacker than a coal—darker than blackness** [so marg. E. V., CALVIN, BOOTHROYD, GERLACH, WORDSWORTH. BROUGHTON and NOYES, like the E. V. Vulg., RASHI, KIMCHI, *black coals*. Sept., *soot*. OWEN suggests *darker than Sihor*, or the river Nile, see Jer. ii. 18.] **They are not [were not] known—recognized—in the streets.** See ver. 5. The sense is, in their houses they might perhaps be recognized, but not on the streets.—**Their skin cleaveth [cleaved] to their bones.** See Job xix. 20; xxx. 30.—**It is withered, it is become like a stick—it is [it became] dry as wood.** [The English version—it is *withered*—arose from taking the adjective *dry*, for the verb to *dry*. No other English version has it so.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 9. This verse enters into close connection with ver. 8. Here it is declared that the miserable condition described in ver. 8, is the consequence of starvation; and at the same time, the reflection is made that death by hunger is more dreadful than death by the sword.—**They that be slain with the sword, are better than they that be slain with hunger; Happier are they who are slain by the sword, than they who are by hunger slain [Happier were the slain by the sword, than the slain by the famine.** Translating the words in the past time, removes them from the category of a moral or psychological reflection, and restores the harmony of the style as a poetical description of actual events. It reminds us, too, that the nobles suffered from the sword, as well as by famine. They who died quickly by means of the sword were more fortunate than those who suffered a lingering death by starvation. So in ver. 6, the Prophet regards, for similar reasons, the destruction of Sodom as less

severe and terrible than that of Jerusalem.—W. H. H.]—For these pine away—*marg., flow out,—stricken through for want of the fruits of the field—Who pine away pierced in the heart for want of the fruits of the field.* This clause declares two things in reference to those slain by the sword (חָלַלְיָהָרֶב), and those slain by hunger

(חָלַלְיָרָעָב), one in which they agree, and one in which they differ. 1. That wherein they agree; they are both pierced through (פָּקְדָרָעָבִים). 2. That wherein they differ: those that starve, *melt away*, that is to say, they die slowly, whilst with the others, death is quickly over.

[The Versions and commentators accept generally the translation given above of the last clause of this verse. Yet there are serious objections to it, and cogent reasons for adopting a different rendering. 1. It is taken for granted that the relative שֶׁהָיָה must refer to the last subject mentioned, *those slain or killed, by hunger.* It is more grammatical to refer it to the principal subject of the preceding clause, which is *those slain by the sword*, regarding the sentence as only begun in the first clause and finished in the second. The words

בְּחָלְלֵי רָעָב, *than those killed by famine*, could be transposed to the end of the verse without changing the grammatical construction in the least, (though it would mar the rhythm and the poetical paronomasia), and this shows that they are entirely subordinate to the main idea. 2. A meaning is forced upon the verb זָרַח, of *melting* or *pinning away*, as descriptive of a slow death, which it has in no other place in Scripture. In the only place where it has been supposed to have the meaning of *dissolving*, Jer. xlix. 4, Dr. NAEGELSBACH himself says it has not that sense (see gram. note above), and if it has, it would imply rather a sudden, mysterious disappearance, than a slow and prolonged dissolution. The affinity between the Latin words *tabescere* and *liquescere*, brought forward by PAREAU, and confirmed by a quotation from SENECA, which has been repeated by nearly every commentator since, even last of all by GERLACH, is of no force whatever; not only because the usage of Latin thought and expression is of no authority in Hebrew; but because *liquescere*, the fundamental idea of which is to become liquid, to melt, has a natural affinity to *tabescere*, to melt gradually, be dissolved and hence, metaphorically, to waste or pine away, while זָרַח, the fundamental idea of which is to flow out or gush out, has no natural affinity to זָרַח, even if the fundamental idea of זָרַח is to melt, and certainly no affinity to זָרַח in the only senses in which it is used in the Hebrew Bible, of *pinning away*, or being distressed with sorrow or fear. On the other hand, the only sense in which the word זָרַח is elsewhere used, as when it is applied to the sudden and violent gushing out, or rapid overflowing of water, see Ps. lxxviii. 20; cv. 41; Is. xlviii. 21; Ex. iii. 8, admirably describes the death of those whose lives flowed away as the blood gushed from their hearts, pierced with a sword. 3. The future form of the verb יִזְרַח, is entirely ignored.

It may be difficult, with our different modes of thought, always to detect the purport of a change

in the Hebrew tenses, but it is quite certain that these changes are never purposeless; and here, where a future is suddenly thrust in among preterite tenses, it must have an important bearing upon the meaning intended. What the force of the future here is, depends on the subject of the relative and of the verb. If that subject is *those slain by the famine*, חָלַלְיָרָעָב, then the future may have an optative sense; *these would have flowed out having been pierced, i. e., they would have preferred to die by the sword.* But if, as is more likely, the subject is *those slain by the sword*, חָלַלְיָהָרֶב, then the future has the sense in which Jeremiah so often uses it, of the historical imperfect, and then, too, the relative שֶׁהָיָה, has its more proper sense of *those who*; *Happier were those slain by the sword—those who gushed out having been pierced, i. e., who died instantly as the blood gushed out of their hearts.* 4. A metaphorical meaning is thrust upon פָּקְדָרָעָבִים=*being or having been pierced*, which the word can hardly bear, namely, *pierced with the sharp pains of hunger.* The word is only used of being pierced through bodily with some sharp weapon, as a sword or spear. It is never used metaphorically, not even in Zech. xii. 10; xiii. 3, which have been appealed to; nor yet in Prov. xii. 18, where the piercings of a sword are compared to wounds inflicted by a wicked tongue, for even there the word derived from our verb is used in the literal sense of *bodily piercings*, made by a sword. The word might, it is true, in our text, be an instance of bold, audacious metaphor. But when there are so many other reasons for taking it in its literal sense, we may spare ourselves the task of justifying a metaphorical one. 5. The preposition בְּ, is taken in an unusual sense. CALVIN and others construe it blindly,—*pierced through by the fruits of the earth*, and explain “that all the productions of the earth took vengeance on this wicked people, by refusing the usual supply.” This is too extraordinary a personification of the fruits of the earth to be allowable, and it is a strange thing to charge a crime on an agent that has no existence. We would rather adopt the opinion of Jarchi who explained that their death was caused by the weeds and roots with which, in their hunger they had filled themselves, though it is something new to call weeds and roots, fruits of the earth. The usual explanation is, that they died for want of the fruits of the earth. It is doubtful if בְּ can be explained in any such sense, as Dr. NAEGELSBACH seems to concede, when he says it can only be taken in the sense of *away, far from, without.* There is less difficulty with this word, if we understand the clause in the sense expressed by the Septuagint, ἐπορεύθησαν ἐκκεκεντημένοι ἀπὸ γεννημάτων ἀγρῶν, *they were driven away, having been pierced, from the fruitful fields.* So Chaldeus: “Those fled away, when they were pierced, from the products and fruits of the field, i. e., they were full and satisfied, since they were pierced when their bellies were full of food;” and J. D. MICHAELIS, “*who, suddenly pierced, forsook the rich fruits of the earth* (on which they dwelt).” This explanation really contains the idea expressed by BLAYNEY’S translation, “those, being thrust through, pass away before the fruits of the field, i. e., they pass away at one

stroke, before the means of subsistence fail, and so experience not the misery of wanting them." DATHE supposes a direct comparison between the suddenness of their death and the proverbial withering of the grass. "Quicker yet than the mown grass, they vanished who were pierced with the sword." This idea of their dying before the famine came, throws additional light on the use of the future tense in *יָבִי*, lit., *they were gushing forth from the fruits of the field*. The last

clause of the verse is a more specific statement of what is said in the first clause. Happier were those who fell by the sword, than those who starved to death, especially those who being pierced through, died while yet there were supplies of food in the city. This is the idea I have endeavored to express in the new translation. BOOTHROYD'S translation—*For those pierced pass away, but these for want of the fruits of the field*, would require a new text.—W. H. H.]

IV. 10.

10 The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children: they were their meat in the destruction of the daughter of my people.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 10.—*רַחֲמֵי* (see EWALD, § 164, a; OLSH., p. 412, f) is *ἀπ. λει*. According to the sense it seems to denote, not the external habits of life, as *רַחֲמֵי* and *רַחֲמֵי* (Deut. xxviii. 56), but the inner *habitus*, softness and tenderness of feeling. The etymology favors this, see *רַחֲמֵי* and *רַחֲמֵי*.—The verb *בָּשַׁל* does not occur in Jeremiah.—*יָבִי* is found in Jeremiah once, xxxi. 20.—*פָּרִי־הָאֲדָמָה*, according to FUERST, a secondary form of *פָּרִי־הָאֲדָמָה*, Ps. lxi. 22 (OLSH., p. 417), is found only here. More properly it should be taken, with EWALD (see § 165 c), MAURER, OLSHAUSEN, for the Inf. Piel, see *לִבְלֹת*, Is. vi. 13; Ps. xlix. 15.—The form *לִבְלֹת* Jeremiah never uses.—*בָּשַׁל*. See ii. 11.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 10. This verse exactly corresponds, with respect to its subject, to vers. 3-5, and constitutes in relation to those verses a climax. For whilst vers. 3-5 speak of the pining away of the children, here the yet more terrible fact is told that mothers consumed their own children.—**The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children.** *The hands of tender-hearted women cooked their own children.*

They were their meat in the destruction—*they were food for them in the ruin—of the daughter of My people.* The Poet would say, that the complication of feelings and sensations, caused by their terrible calamity, hurried away even tender-hearted women to the commission of this most horrible crime. See ii. 20. [HENDERSON: "Compare 2 Kings vi. 28, 29; Lev. xxvi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 56, 57. For a most graphic description of such a horrible scene, see JOSEPHUS' account of the siege under Titus, *Bell. Jud. cap. X. 9.*"]

IV. 11.

11 The LORD hath accomplished his fury; he hath poured out his fierce anger, and hath kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 11.—*כָּלֵה*, Jer. ix. 15; xiv. 12; xxvi. 8, etc. See ii. 22.—*חֲמָתוֹ*, see ii. 4.—*אָפוֹ*, see i. 12.—*יָצַת*. All existing forms of this root are very frequent with Jeremiah, ii. 15; ix. 9, 11; xvii. 27, etc.—*יָסֹד* Jeremiah never uses. See Ex. xxx. 4; xiii. 14; Am. i. 4, 7, 10; Ps. cxxxvii. 7, etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. This verse closes the second part of the Poem, in a way entirely similar to that in which ver. 6 closes the first part. In both there is placed in our hand, as it were, a measuring rule, that we may be able to measure the extent and the significance of the catastrophe which has befallen Zion. Only in ver. 6 is indicated the measure of the greatness of Zion's guilt, but

here the measure of the Divine wrath. [The remarkable correspondence between vers. 1-6 and 7-11, which Dr. NÆGELSBACH has so skillfully developed, is argument enough for rejecting the arrangement of GERLACH, who assigns ver. 11 to the second general division of the Poem.—W. H. H.].—**The LORD hath accomplished his fury; he hath poured out his fierce anger, and hath kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof.** *Jehovah fulfilled His wrath, He*

poured out (die Glut seines Zornes) *His hot anger, and kindled a fire in Zion that consumed her foundations.* [GERLACH remarks that the foundations of the city were not literally destroyed, but that this denotes in a general way that the city was razed to the ground. This is explicitly said of Zion, or the sacred part of the city, with special reference to the Sanctuary, which was completely destroyed. See Deut. xxxii. 22; Jer. xxi. 14;

vii. 20. We may regard this as a prophecy of a future destruction that was to come on Zion, when not one stone should be left upon another; or, if not a prophecy, at least an instructive commentary on the causes which led to that catastrophe, and on the catastrophe itself as the result of the wrath and fiery indignation of Jehovah God, accomplishing the threatening of His holy word.—W. H. H.]

PART II.—IV. 12-22.

SECT. III. VERS. 12-16.

- ℣ VER. 12. The kings of the earth believed not,
Nor all the inhabitants of the earth,
That an oppressor and enemy would come
Into Jerusalem's gates.
- Ⓜ VER. 13. On account of the sins of her Prophets,
The crimes of her Priests,
Who shed in the midst of her
Blood of the righteous.
- ℣ VER. 14. They stumbled like blind men through the streets,
Defiled with blood
So that men could not
Touch their garments.
- Ⓜ VER. 15. "Away! unclean!" men cried to them, "away! away! touch not!"
When they fled away, they still stumbled,
Men said among the heathen,
"They shall not longer tarry."
- Ⓜ VER. 16. The anger of Jehovah scattered them;
He will no longer look upon them.
Men showed no favor to priests,
They had no compassion for elders.

SECT. IV. VERS. 17-22.

- ℣ VER. 17. As for us, our eyes failed, still looking
For our vain help:
On our watch-tower we watched
For a people that could not save.
- ℣ VER. 18. They hunted our steps
That we could not go in our streets.
Our end drew near, our days were fulfilled,
Yea, our end was come!
- Ⓜ VER. 19. Swifter were our pursuers
Than the eagles of heaven:
On the mountains, they chased us;
In the wilderness, they lay in wait for us.
- ℣ VER. 20. The breath of our nostrils, the Anointed of Jehovah,
Was taken in their pits,
Of whom we said,
Under his shadow will we live among the nations.
- ℣ VER. 21. Exult and be glad, daughter of Edom,
That dwellest in the land of Uz,
To thee, also, shall the cup pass over,
Thou shalt be drunk and make thyself naked.

ת VER. 22. Consumed is thy guilt, daughter of Zion,
 No longer does He make thee captive.
 He visits thy guilt, daughter of Edom,
 He uncovers thy sins.

ANALYSIS.

PART THIRD, vers. 12-16, treats of the causes of the terrible catastrophe. What even the heathen had not deemed possible, ver. 12, had been brought about by the sins of the prophets and priests, especially by their blood-guiltiness, ver. 13, in consequence of which they had been proscribed by their own countrymen, and not only so, but even in foreign countries they had been chased from place to place, and scattered and treated in the worst manner, without respect to age or condition, vers. 14-16. PART FOURTH describes the failure of the hope resting on Egyptian help, ver. 17; for the Chaldeans, in order to prevent the flight of the king, kept the most careful watch, whereby this means of escape was prevented, ver. 18; when, nevertheless, the flight was at last attempted and frustrated by the rapid pursuit, the only hope the fugitives still cherished, to be able to live among a foreign people, in the enjoyment of freedom, at least, under the shadow of their own king, was destroyed, vers. 19, 20. The last two verses, 21, 22, which constitute the conclusion of the whole, contain a short address to Edom, which, on account of its malevolent joy at the downfall of Zion, is forewarned of a similar fate, whilst in the same connection, the prospect is exhibited to Zion of the remission of her guilt and an end of her captivity.

Vers. 12-16. This third part contains an exposition of the causes of the punishment inflicted. What had been regarded, even among the heathen, as impossible, namely, that the gates of Jerusalem should be entered by force, ver. 12, this the godless priests and prophets, by their bloody cruelty, had rendered possible, ver. 13. Thus they became an object of abhorrence to Israel and to the heathen, vers. 14, 15, so that, tolerated nowhere, they were scattered abroad and compelled to suffer the hardest of fates, ver. 16.

IV. 12-16.

12 The kings of the earth, and all the inhabitants of the world, would not have believed that the adversary and the enemy should have entered into the gates of
 13 Jerusalem. For the sins of her prophets and the iniquities of her priests that have
 14 shed the blood of the just in the midst of her. They have wandered as blind men in the streets, they have polluted themselves with blood, so that men could not
 15 touch their garments. They cried unto them, Depart ye; it is unclean; depart, depart, touch not: when they fled away and wandered, they said among the heathen,
 16 They shall no more sojourn there. The anger of the LORD hath divided them; he will no more regard them: they respected not the persons of the priests, they favoured not the elders.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 12.—The Hiphil of אָכַן, once in Jeremiah, xii. 6.—כָּל־כִּי־אָרִין, Jer. xxv. 20.—[אָכַל]. The א, omitted by K'ri, and by some MSS. and Masoretic editions, and by Sept., is expressed in Syr., Chald. and Vulg. BLAYNEY.—הַבֵּל is found in Jeremiah only in the critically suspected passages x. 12; li. 15. The phrase כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל תִּבְּל is found *verbatim* Ps. xxxiii. 8, comp. xxiv. 1; xcvi. 7.—Jeremiah never uses צַר in the singular, see i. 5, 7, 10. צַר is used in connection with אוֹיֵב, as here, in Esth. vii. 6.—שָׁעֲרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם, Jer. i. 15; xvii. 19, 21, 27; xxii. 19.

Ver. 13.—בְּקִרְבָּהּ. See Jer. iv. 14; vi. 6; etc., and remarks on Lam. iii. 45.—The expression, דָּם צְדִיקִים, occurs only here; elsewhere it is always said דָּם נָקִי, e. g. Deut. xxi. 8; 2 Kings xxiv. 4, or דָּם הַנָּקִי, Jer. xxii. 17, or נָקִים, Jer. xix. 4.

Ver. 14.—Jeremiah uses גָּנַע once, xiv. 10. See Zeph. i. 17.—גָּנַע, once in Jer., xxxi. 8. [BLAYNEY and OWEN take עָוִיר as participle Pual of עָוַר to rouse or excite.]—בְּחוֹצוֹת—גִּנְאָלוֹ בָּרָם. The words are taken from Is. lix. 3. גִּנְאָל, softened from גִּנְעָל (Lev. xxvi. 11, 15; Jer. xiv. 19). With reference to form, blended of Niphal and Pual, see OLSH. § 275, EWALD, § 132, b., DELITZSCH, Is. p. 566 [GREEN'S Gr., exceedingly defiled, § 83, c. 2, § 122, 2]. גִּנְאָל is found in Jeremiah only in the sense of loosening, redeeming; see iii. 58.—The construction of יִבְּלֵה with the finite verb is equivalent to the same with the Infinitive, i. 14. See iii. 3, 5; Esth. viii. 6; my Gr. § 95, g. rem. יִבְּל is frequent in Jeremiah, see iii. 5; xviii. 6; xx. 7, etc.—נָגַע in Jeremiah, iv. 10, 18; xii. 14, etc.—לְבָנִישׁ, Jer. x. 9.

Ver. 15.—סֹרֵר in Jeremiah, v. 23; xv. 5, etc.—טָמֵא in the Singular, never in Jeremiah: he uses only once הַטָּמֵאִים, xix. 13. [If he could use the plural only once, why not the singular only once?—W. H. II.]—In the words סֹרֵר סֹרֵרֵי אֶל־הַנְּעִי the Poet seems to have in mind Is. lii. 11, where the same words are used, only they are addressed, not to the unclean, but to the clean.—נָקִי (kindred to נָגַע, but occurring in this signification only here) is not found in Jeremiah. [GERLACH derives נָצַח from נָצַח, which Jeremiah does use in its Aramaic form, and in same sense as here, Jer.

xlvi. 9.—W. H. H.]—נָגַד, see נָגַד, Ps. xcv. 9.—Jeremiah uses נָגַד frequently in chs. xlii.—xliv. (see xlii. 15, 17, 22, etc.)—Hiphil הוֹכִיף is found in the P ophet only once, xxxi. 12, whilst it occurs in this chapter three times, vers. 13, 16, 22.

Ver. 16.—חָלַק (Hiphil occurs in Jeremiah only once in a passage critically doubtful, xxxvii. 12) is to *scatter*, as Gen. xlix. 7. With regard to its singular number, see my *Gr.* § 105, 6.—יֹכִיף, see ver. 15.—הִבִּיט, see i. 11.—The phrase שָׂא פָנָיו, elsewhere very frequently (see Deut. x. 17; 2 Kings v. 1; Job xiii. 10; Ps. lxxxii. 2; Prov. xviii. 5; Is. iii. 3; Mal. ii. 9; comp. Lam. v. 12), is not found in Jeremiah.—Of חָנַן Jeremiah uses the Niphal only once, xxii. 23.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12 skilfully introduces the exposition of the causes of what had happened, since the presumption, entertained even by the heathen, that it was impossible for any human enemy to take Jerusalem by force, was disproved (zur Follgegeben wird) by the sad reality.—**The kings of the earth, and all the inhabitants of the world, would not have believed—had not believed—that the adversary and the enemy should have entered—that an oppressor and enemy would come—into the gates of Jerusalem.** It is clear that this verse contains a hyperbole. For Jerusalem had been captured more than once before the days of Nebuchadnezzar (see 1 Kings xiv. 26; 2 Kings xiv. 13, 14; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11; 2 Kings xxxiii. 33–35). In spite of this fact, the opinion that it could not be taken by force may have prevailed among the heathen, but hardly to the extent which the Poet here seems to ascribe to it. [Not only was Jerusalem regarded as well-nigh impregnable, because it was strongly fortified by nature and art; but there was a prevailing sentiment among men that it was under the special protection of the Almighty. The heathen idolaters knew to their cost that the God whom the Jews worshipped was a God of great power. They believed that the city of Jerusalem and its Temple were under the special protection of that God. The discomfiture of Sennacherib's army in the days of Hezekiah at the very gates of Jerusalem, and the prolonged siege of the city by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar, were well calculated to deepen the impression that the God of the Jews would not suffer the city to be taken. To this sentiment the Prophet here refers. What he says is pregnant and inferential. He assumes that to be true, which even the heathen *believed*, that the city could not be taken unless God gave it up to destruction. God's giving it up to destruction implied that the city was guilty of great and heinous sins; and without pausing to state an inference so patent, the Prophet proceeds at once to specify the particular sins which led to a catastrophe that had astonished *the kings of the earth and all the inhabitants of the world.* He thus condenses several thoughts into one expression;—what even heathen had not expected had happened, and was evidence to all the world of the horrible wickedness, which must have provoked God to forsake His people! There is no reason, therefore, for the suspicion that the Prophet indulged in poetical exaggeration, even if "Jerusalem had been captured more than once before the days of Nebuchadnezzar." In point of fact, however, this last assertion may be questioned. There is no clear evidence that Je-

rusalem had ever before fallen into actual possession of a *heathen* enemy. There is no evidence at all that it had ever been taken by *assault*. On the occasions referred to in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11 and 2 Kings xxxiii. 33–35, it does not appear that the city of Jerusalem was actually occupied by the enemy, or even visited by them, and there is no intimation whatever of its being attacked and taken by arms. From the account given in 2 Chron. xii. 4–9, we would infer that Rehoboam bought peace by giving up the treasures of the city: and that if he surrendered the city at all, he did so without waiting for battle. JOSEPHUS declares that Shishak took the city without fighting (Ant. B. viii. ch. x. § 3)—and that this was the only time it ever was taken before Nebuchadnezzar (Jewish War, B. vi. ch. x. § 1). But there is no positive evidence that the Egyptians actually took possession of the city. The account of the invasion of Judah by the Philistines and Arabians, 2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17, is very brief and vague. If the king's house which they rifled, was the palace in Jerusalem, it does not follow that the whole city fell into their possession, or that it was taken by assault. Joash, king of Israel, 2 Chron. xxv. 21–24, undoubtedly took possession of the city and dismantled and destroyed its defences. But Joash was not a *heathen* king, neither did he take the city by *assault*. Having already defeated the armies of Judah in the field, he seems to have met with no resistance at all before the walls of Jerusalem.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 13. EWALD takes vers. 12, 13, as a question. Would the kings of the earth . . . believe, that the enemy and oppressor had entered the gates of Jerusalem *only* on account of the sins of her prophets . . . who shed blood . . . in the midst of her? The objections to this are:

1. The negative particle, לֹא, ver. 12, is not the same as the interrogative particle הֲ. Should we take it as intended for לֹא=is not, an affirmative answer would be expected. 2. EWALD is obliged to insert, between vers. 12, 13, an *only* which is not in the text, for he perceives that the heathen might be shaken in the opinion referred to, by a general apostasy of the people, but not by the apostasy of particular individuals.—MEIER and KALKAR, on the other hand, connect vers. 13, 14, and take the verb וַיִּנְדְּ=they *wandered*, in ver. 14, as predicate of the principal proposition. But in this case the people must be regarded as the subject, which contradicts the whole context. We must, therefore, regard ver. 13, with THEUNIS and most others, as an exclamation; or, as MAURER does, supply a הִיא הָיָה זֶה=this came to pass, after ver. 13.—For—on account of—the sins of her pro-

phets and [there is no conjunction in the Heb.] the iniquities of her priests, that have shed the blood of the just in the midst of her. See Jer. xxvi. 7-24, where it is manifest that the chief guilt of the blood of the martyrs rested on the priests and prophets. Compare Jer. vi. 13-15; xxiii. 11-15, with ii. 34; vii. 6; xix. 4; xxii. 3, 17; Ez. xxii. 25-29; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14. [GATAKER: "Not that the people were not faulty, as well as either of these, in those wicked pranks and practices that were then committed; but that these were foremost and forwardest ring-leaders and encouragers of them unto those wicked courses, which they should have reprov'd in them, and from which they should have endeavored to restrain them." CALVIN: "He mentions one kind of sins, that they shed the blood of the righteous in the midst of Jerusalem. They had no doubt led the people astray in other things, for they flattered their vices and gave loose reins to licentiousness; but the Prophet here fixed on one particular sin, the most grievous; for they had not only, by their errors and false doctrines and flatteries, led away the people from the fear of God, but had also obstinately defended their impiety, and by force and cruelty repressed their faithful teachers, and put to death the witnesses of God; for by the righteous or just he no doubt means the prophets. For what JEROME and others say, that blood had been shed because false teachers draw souls to perdition, is frivolous and wholly foreign to what Jeremiah had in view; for the word *righteous* cannot be applied to those miserable men who were ensnared to their own ruin. Then Jeremiah, after having denounced the sin of the prophets and the iniquity of the priests, mentions the savage cruelty which was as it were the summit of all their vices."]

Ver. 14 **They have wandered as blind men in the streets, they have polluted themselves with blood.** *They staggered as blind (men) through the streets, defiled with blood.* [Wandered. The verb is more frequently used in the sense of *staggering, reeling* (so GERLACH), or *stumbling* (BROUGHTON, NOYES), than in any other, and this sense is very appropriate to the uncertain motion of blind men, who are not much addicted to wandering about the streets.—W. H. H.].—**As blind men.** The idea cannot be *cædium perpetrarum insatiabili cupiditate occæcati* [blinded by insatiable desire to commit murders], as ROSENUELLER would have it; for they have in fact already shed blood and therefore it is added that they were *defiled with blood*. Rather, they are, as it were, drunk with the blood they have already shed, and in this drunkenness they go along as if blind, not observing whom they may chance to touch with their blood-stained clothes.—**So that men could not** (*marg. in that they could not but*) **touch their garments**—*when one could not* [*i. e. lawfully*] **touch their garments.**—**So that** (EWALD, THENIUS). בְּלֹא cannot be so rendered. It stands before the whole negative sentence, as before a single word. This sentence contains a statement on the subject of Levitical cleanness, with respect to the uncleanness they contracted by the contamination referred to. Thus: *They staggered . . . in a*

condition in which it was not lawful for any one to touch them. [GERLACH, whose explanation agrees with that just given, except that for no sufficient reason he renders the verbs in the present tense, has more accurately expressed the sense of the original, than, perhaps, any other commentator. "According to the whole drift of the chapter, which describes the consequences of the judgment with respect to particular classes and conditions of the people, the following verses present a description of the judgment inflicted on the wicked Prophets and Priests, but not a mere fragment of the history of the late siege. This opinion is confirmed by the very first words of ver. 14 (*they stagger as if blind*), which denote elsewhere, as a comparison with Deut. xxviii. 28, 29; Jer. xxiii. 12; Isa. xxix. 9; lix. 10 shows, the effect of Divine punishment. * * The Prophets and Priests should be the eyes of the people: they have become blind and stagger about helplessly (*rathlos und hilflos*) as blind men do; thus has God's hand smitten them on account of their sins. The evil marks of their sins they carried about with them openly, so that all the world could recognize them and avoid their touch, lest they should become themselves unclean."—Other translations and interpretations have been given, all involving great difficulties. BLAYNEY's is unique. "*They ran frantic through the streets, they were stained with blood; such as they could not overpower, they touched their clothes.* The meaning is, that if they could no otherwise harm those they met with in the streets, they defiled them by touching their garments." This, besides the impossible translations, is open to the objection (that may be made to ROSENUELLER's and BOOTHROYD's glosses, who represent the Prophets and Priests, blinded by passion, seeking for blood), namely, that the prophets and priests shed the blood of the just, "not by raving through the streets, sword in hand, but in a more secret way, by instigating their agents" (NOYES).—W. H. H.]

Ver 15. **They cried unto them, Depart ye** (*marg. ye polluted*); **it is unclean; depart, depart, touch not:**—*Away! unclean one! they cried to them,—away! away! touch not! Who calls כָּרִיר [=depart ye, begone, or away!]? Not the murderers, as is evident from the words they cried* [*i. e. men cried*] *unto them* [for the pronoun must refer to the murderers.—W. H. H.]. THENIUS thinks, those who met together may have called out thus to each other. But לָלוּ (*to them*) cannot mean *one another*. It might, indeed, be taken in the sense of *de iis* [concerning them], as PAREAU prefers, with an appeal to Ps. iii. 3; lxxxvii. 5, etc. But then the second half of the verse, in which those murderers suddenly appear as fugitives, is deprived of its appropriate explanation. I take the words then as a call addressed to the murderers. According to Lev. xiii. 45, the lepers were required to call out to those meeting them, טָמֵא טָמֵא ["unclean, unclean!"]. The same cry is here addressed to those, who, without reflecting on their uncleanness, stagger about on the streets, as if blind, amongst those walking there. [WORDSWORTH: "The Priests and Prophets, who, in their spiritual pride, formerly said to others, 'Come not near to me; I am

holier than thou' (Is. lxxv. 5), shall be loathed by others, as being polluted by blood, and men shall cry to them *tâmê! tâmê!* (*unclean! unclean!*)—words which the leper was obliged to cry out, in order to keep others from him (Lev. xiii. 45). The singular number (*unclean*) is here used, in order to connect the words with that cry of the leper"]. But this cry—*סָרִי=away! depart ye!*—is addressed to them most urgently, and so repeatedly that they recognize themselves as proscribed, and—are compelled to flee. The threefold repetition of *סָרִי, away!* seems to me to indicate, that not merely immediately after the murders, but persistently all contact with them as with unclean persons was avoided. Thus they were, as was said, proscribed.—**When they fled away and wandered**—*when they had fled away they continued fugitively wandering about [for] they said among the heathen, They shall no more sojourn there*—it was said among the heathen, *They shall not longer tarry*. Now that they had fled, yet even in a foreign land they found no rest. THENIUS, most unnecessarily and very awkwardly, supposes a flight to the Chaldeans, who had separated these outlaws without affording them a permanent place of abode (*בָּרִי*) and carried them away into captivity to various different places. But those enemies of Jeremiah, who hated him so bitterly and persecuted him, especially on account of his constant admonition to submit themselves to the Chaldeans (see Jer. xxxvii., xxxviii.), certainly did not themselves go over to the Chaldeans. Rather, it is only indicated here, in a general way, that those outlaws might have fled to heathen nations. But if they had, the words *נָעִי וְנָעִי* (*also they wandered*) show that their *נָעִי* (*wandering*) did not end with their *נָעִי* (*flight*). If they had fled, also they wandered about, that is to say, if they on their flight, after manifold wanderings, thought that they had found at some particular place a secure retreat, then men said even there among the heathen, *they shall not tarry longer*. They are then driven away even from there. This so plainly reminds us of the restless and fugitive wanderings of Cain, the first murderer, that we take for granted that the Poet had Gen. iv. 12-14 (*נָעַד נָעַד*) in his mind. [If *נָעִי* in ver. 14 means *they staggered*, as men smitten by God with judicial blindness, it seems necessary to give it the same meaning in ver. 15. The sense is explained by the judicial use of the word as expressive of God's judgments; see ver. 14. GERLACH: "When they fled away, they have

likewise staggered about, which, on account of the evident reference to *נָעִי* (*they staggered*) in ver. 14, must mean that they staggered about as helplessly as they did before in the city; and were avoided in the same way. For if they would escape the scorn of their own people by a hasty departure from them, yet the nations, from whom they sought a hospitable reception (*נָעִי*), would refuse it to them. Men said, *They shall no longer remain as guests; see Lament. xxviii. 65, 66: 'and among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest.'*"—W. H. H.]

Ver. 16. **The anger (marg. face) of the LORD hath divided them**—*Jehovah's countenance has scattered them*. Thus the Poet describes what is known to him of the actual condition of those outlaws, in consequence of their banishment. They could not even remain together, but must be scattered. By the expression *the face of Jehovah*, the scattering is traced back to Jehovah as its cause, who had not lost sight of them, but had directed upon them His countenance inimically. See Ps. xxxiv. 17 (16). [See also Lev. xvii. 10; Ps. xxi. 10 (9). In the latter passage the words *in the time of Thine anger*, are literally *in the time of Thy face*. There may be an allusion here to Jer. xvi. 17, 18, "For Mine eyes are upon all their ways: they are not hid from My face, neither is their iniquity hid from Mine eyes. And I will first recompense their iniquity and their sin double." When God forgives our sins, we may say, "Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back," Is. xxxviii. 17. But when He punishes them, we are compelled to say, "We are consumed by Thine anger, and by Thy wrath are we troubled. Thou hast set our iniquities before Thee, our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance." Ps. xc. 7, 8.—W. H. H.]—**He will no more regard them**. The verb is future, *וְלֹא יִרְאֶה*. The Poet predicts for the scattered ones, that there will be no more favorable change of Jehovah's mind towards them.—**They respected not the persons of the priests, they favoured not the elders**. *The priests found not forbearance, the elders found no compassion* [or, we may translate more literally as E. V. understanding that the subject of the verbs are the heathen, or men generally; and the wicked murderous priests and elders are the objects of the verbs. God has irretrievably cast them away; and men scorn and injure them.—W. H. H.] Men deal with them without regard to their condition or age.

IV. 17-20.

- 17 As for us, our eyes as yet failed for our vain help: in our watching we have
 18 watched for a nation that could not save us. They hunt our steps, that we cannot
 19 go in our streets: our end is near, our days are fulfilled; for our end is come. Our
 20 persecutors are swifter than the eagles of the heaven: they pursued us upon the
 mountains, they laid wait for us in the wilderness. The breath of our nostrils, the
 anointed of the LORD, was taken in their pits, of whom we said, Under his shadow
 we shall live among the heathen.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 17.—**עֹרִינָה** [K'ri, עֹרִינָה]. The form is a monstrosity. For, 1. **עֹר** never stands in the plural with suffixes. 2. If we suppose that the suffix is joined to **עֹרִים**, then it should be written **עֹרִיָה** or **עֹרִיָהָ**. 3. The suffix form **יָנָה** is entirely abnormal. The only possible analogy would be **גִּיתִיָנָה**, Ez. i. 11, according to which **עֹרִיָנָה** would be contracted from **עֹרִיָנָה**. But on what does the plural suffix depend? To meet this difficulty the Masorites read **עֹרִינָה**. [So CALVIN, *while we were yet standing*: BLATNEY, HENDERSON, OWEN, *while yet or still we existed*. BLATNEY conjectures that the final **ה** "is a corruption, not of a single י, but of two ין, the latter of which ought to be prefixed to **תְּכִלִּינָה**, where by its conversive force, it not only clears the passage from all difficulty, but brings the text into a perfect agreement with the LXX., Syr. and Vulg. Versions."] But here also the difficulty remains that the suffix would be joined to **עֹרִים**. OLSEN-HAUSEN (222, c) on this account assumes that **עֹרִינָה** stands for **עֹרִנָה**, and that the K'tib is the result of an error in writing. The latter seems to me also probable: only I believe that the feminine ending of the suffix is correct, and that the ' before **נָה** was occasioned by the immediately following **תְּכִלִּינָה**. The word then had the sound originally of **עֹרִנָה** (1 Kings i. 22). **עֹרִנָה**, as a proposition, with a predicate to be supplied, is it is true also abnormal, even if only the idea of *being* is supplied. Yet the sense is pertinent. *She*, that is to say Jerusalem, *still stood*. We may refer to the grammatical construction to Jer. xl. 3. [This is ROSENUELLER's explanation. But there is no particular reference to the city in the whole preceding part of the Song; and neither *the city* nor *Zion* is in the mind of the writer or the reader. If then we adopt the reading **עֹרִנָה**, the explanation of THENIUS is certainly to be preferred, "*Whilst this was or happened*,—namely, the incident just related with reference to the fugitives." But GERLACH is of the opinion that **יָנָה** can be taken as *suff. 3 pers. fem. plur.* referring to *the eyes*. He refers to an analogous case in Ps. lxxiii. 5, **יָנוּ** in **אֲנִינָמוּ**, and explains its occurrence here as influenced by sympathy with **תְּכִלִּינָה** and a desire to distinguish the suffix from the singular form in **עֹרִנָה**, 1 Kings, i. 22. Then the translation is *Yet our eyes wasted themselves in looking for our help*. So BROUGHTON, *Even yet our eyes are spent at our vain help*, and NOYES, *Still did our eyes fail, looking for help in vain*. The same sense may be retained if we adopt the K'ri, *adhuc nos (sc. conficimur) vel potius oculi nostri conficiuntur* (GERLACH). Yet if the K'ri is adopted, the lit. translation would be, *as yet we see*, see Josh. xiv. 11. The fact that this is the *initial* word, gives to it an emphasis, both accurately and felicitously expressed in the English Version, *As for us still our eyes failed looking for our vain help*.—W. H. H.] **תְּכִלִּינָה עֵינֵינוּ**. See ii. 11.—**עֹרָה**, in Jer. xxxvii. 7. For the construction of **הִכְלִינָה הִכְלִינָה**, see my Gr. 63, 4, g. [The possessive pronoun, as a suffix, may come between a noun and the word qualifying it, and then the pronoun and qualifying word are to be expressed together: *our help of vanity=our vain help*. See NAEGELS. Gr.—W. H. H.]—**הִכְלִינָה** in Jer. xvi. 19; x. 3, 8; ii. 5, *etc.*—**צָפָה** is *ἀπ. ἀε.* **צָפָה**, in Jer. vi. 17; xlviii. 19.—**הוֹשִׁיעַ**, Jer. xi. 12; xiv. 9; xlii. 11, *etc.* See also **יִשְׁעִיל**, Jer. ii. 11. Yet Is. xlv. 20 seems to have been especially in the Poet's mind, where it is said **אֵל-יִשְׁעִיל לֹא יִשְׁעִי**.

Ver. 18.—Concerning **צָרָה**, see iii. 52. With reference to the signification *insidiare, lying-in-wait for*, see Mic. vii. 2; Prov. vi. 26, and the nearly related **צָרָה**, 1 Sam. xxiv. 12. The reading **צָרוּ**, which some Codices have after the analogy of Prov. iv. 12; Job xviii. 7, gives a less suitable sense. [The change of **צָרוּ** into **צָרוּ** may have been suggested by the difficulty of interpreting the former in accordance with its proper signification of *seizing, catching or obtaining by hunting*. See Notes below.—W. H. H.]—**צָרָה**, in Jeremiah once, x. 23. [BLATNEY: "The LXX. instead of **צָרָה** seem to have read **צָרָה**, *our little ones*." Here again is a change of the text suggested, doubtless, by the difficulty of *hunting* (or *seizing upon as prey*) the footsteps.—W. H. H.]—For the construction of **מִלְכָּת** see **מִתְנַבְּכוֹת**, ver. 9.—**רָחֹב**, Jer. v. 1; xlviii. 38, *etc.*—**קָרָב**, see iii. 57.—**מִלְכָּת יָמֵינוּ**. The expression is elsewhere used of filling up the measure of the days of one's life, see Jer. xxv. 34; 1 Chron. xvii. 11.—**קָץ**, Jer. li. 3, comp. Am. viii. 2; Ez. vii. 2-6.

Ver. 19.—**קָלִים**. The Prophet uses the adjective **קָל** in ii. 23; iii. 9; xlv. 6. **רָדְפֵינוּ**, see i. 3.—The phrase **נִשְׁרִי** occurs only here: yet see Prov. xxiii. 5; xxx. 19.—**דָּלֵק** is properly speaking *to glow with heat, to burn*, Ps. vii. 14; Ez. xxiv. 10. Then it is used in the transferred sense of *hot pursuit*, and indeed at first with **אֲחֵרֵי** (as it were, *burning after me*) Gen. xxxi. 36; 1 Sam. xvii. 53. Only in this place is the word construed directly as transitive with the Acc. of the object. Jeremiah never avails himself of the word.—**מִדְּבָר**, very frequent in Jer., ii. 2, 6; iii. 2, *etc.*—**אֲכָב**, see iii. 10.

Ver. 20.—The expression **אֲפִינִי** is not found in Jeremiah; but, founded on Gen. vii. 27, in Ex. xv. 8; Ps. xviii. 6 (2 Sam. xxii. 16); Job iv. 9; comp. Cant. vii. 9.—**מִשְׁחָה** is not found in Jeremiah. See 1 Sam. xxiv. 6, 7, 11; xxvi. 9, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam. i. 14, 16; xix. 22; xxiii. 1.—**לִכְרֵב**, Jeremiah uses frequently. See li. 56; xxxviii. 28; xlviii. 1, *etc.*—**שָׁחִית** (comp. **שָׁחַת**, Prov. xxiii. 10) is found, besides here, only in Ps. cvii. 20.—**עָלָה**, Jer. vi. 4; xlviii. 45.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 17-20. With few but telling strokes the Prophet here sketches a picture of the events which constitute the last stadium of the great catastrophe, ending with the imprisonment of the king. He describes how they in Jerusalem had placed their last hope on Egyptian help,

which was not realized, ver. 17. Then, omitting all that had reference to the capture of the city itself, he passes over to the flight of the king, which he describes so graphically, that we are obliged to regard him as a participator in the events he narrates. He describes how they were so closely watched, that soon all hope of escape forsook them, ver. 18. With extraordinary celerity they were pursued, ver. 19, and the king

was imprisoned. With that, their last hope, the hope that they might live under his shadow, in the enjoyment at least of liberty, even if among foreign people, was frustrated, ver. 20.

Ver. 17. **As for us, our eyes yet failed for our vain help.** *Yet stood she! Our eyes longed after our vain help.* She, that is to say Jerusalem, still stood, exclaims the Poet with emphasis, and thus transports us into the historical event of which he treats. [For the reasons stated above in Textual and Grammatical Notes, the correct translation seems to be, *Still did our eyes fail looking for our vain help.* Literally, *Still our eyes exhausted or spent themselves* (looking) *for our vain help.*—W. H. H.] The Poet describes here the yearning long-cherished hope of Egyptian help. The retreat of the Chaldean army (Jer. xxxvii. 5) had greatly strengthened that hope. But it proved delusive. Instead of the Egyptian army, the Chaldeans were soon seen again approaching the city (Jer. xxxvii. 8; xxxiv. 22). [**Our vain help.** CALVIN: "There is an implied contrast between empty and fallacious help and the help of God, which the people rejected when they preferred the Egyptians."—**In our watching—on our watch-tower** [so BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, NOYES, GERLACH, DAVIDSON *Lex.*, FUERST *Lex.*].—**We have watched for a nation that could not save us—we watched for a people that helps not** [or, *will not help* (GERLACH), or, may not, *i. e.* cannot save.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 18. **They hunt our steps, that we cannot go in our streets.**—*They watched our steps that we could not go on our streets.* EWALD understands the first half of the verse as referring to an edict of the Egyptian king, which prohibited the refugees who were in Egypt from carrying on traffic of any kind with Palestine. This was considered, and not without reason, the harshest measure that could be imposed upon them. But we have not the least knowledge of any kind of trade with the markets of Palestine at the time of its depopulation, or of any prohibition of visiting those markets. Besides, it is not at all probable that the Jews, who had fled to Egypt, impelled by fear of the Chaldeans, would have had any desire to go back again within the reach of the power of the Chaldeans. Then, too, this thought in this connection seems an excessively awkward *ὑστερον πρότερον* [putting last first]. THENIUS and VAHINGER [BLAYNEY, also] understand these words of the besieging towers, whence the streets were bombarded and so walking in them was prevented. I will not deny that from these towers (see remarks on Jer. lii. 4, 5) the city might be watched. But to refer the words that *we could not walk in the streets* to the bombardment of the streets, seems to me a singular notion. We are not to suppose that the besieging machines of the ancients carried cannon. [Remembering how narrow the streets of oriental cities are and how protected, often, by the buildings projecting over them, it is obvious that no besieging towers could so command the streets as to expose the citizens to the aim of the enemies' weapons.—W. H. H.] We read in Jer. lii. 7, 8, "And all the men of war fled, by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king's

garden: (now the Chaldeans were by the city round about;) and they went by the way of the plain. But the army of the Chaldeans pursued after the king, and overtook Zedekiah in the plains of Jericho; and all his army was scattered from him." See 2 Kings xxv. 4, 5. From this description it appears, 1st. That Zedekiah with his men of war endeavored to escape secretly, and did so escape by a flight at night from a gate situated on the west side of the city. 2d. That the Chaldeans sought to prevent his escape. This is evident from their surrounding the city, as well as from the secret flight and immediate pursuit. It is also obvious, a priori, that Nebuchadnezzar was near at hand for the very purpose of getting possession of the person of the king. Now does not our passage answer exactly to all this? All the steps of the beleaguered citizens were observed, so that they could not go upon their streets unhindered. I do not understand רחכות=*streets* of the country roads. But I believe that the passages leading out of the city, as for example the way between the walls, can be classed with the רחכות=*streets*. [The verb rendered *hunt*, צד, means (see remarks on iii. 52), not merely to hunt, but to take by hunting, not merely to lay snares (NOYES), but to ensnare or take in snares. It clearly has this meaning, it seems to me, both in Mic. vii. 2 and Prov. vi. 26. The word rendered *streets*, רחכות, means the streets of a city, as is plainly evident here from the expression *our streets*. בִּרְחֹכֵינוּ, in our own streets, can only mean the streets of our city, and that no out of the way passages between the walls, but streets that were common property, and which they were accustomed to walk in. Our text then can only mean that those who appeared on the streets were at once arrested. Zedekiah and his army were not captured in the streets, but far away from the city. It is obvious, therefore, that neither this verse, nor the following one, refers particularly to the flight and capture of Zedekiah and his army. It relates to a time posterior to that event. The city was already in possession of the Chaldeans: the enemy had entered into the gates of Jerusalem (ver. 12), which did not occur till one month after Zedekiah's capture. The Prophet having announced in ver. 11, that the Divine wrath was accomplished, and Zion consumed with fire to the very foundations thereof, goes back in vers. 12-16, to attribute this event to the sins of the prophets and priests, and to show how they were abhorred and punished,—then in ver. 17, he tells us, how those that were left in the city continued to the very last to hope for Egyptian aid,—in ver. 18, that they could not escape from the city, for they were captured the moment they appeared in the streets,—in ver. 19, that those who did manage to escape from the city, were pursued and captured, whether they fled to the mountains or the desert,—and ver. 20, declaring that their king was already a prisoner, recognizes the fact that the kingdom is destroyed and their independent nationality is at an end. With all this the last half of ver. 18 harmonizes; when they found that the Egyptians did not come, and that they were wholly in the power of the Chaldeans,

then it was evident that their end was near, their days fulfilled,—yea, their end had actually come! We translate the first half of the verse, therefore, *They hunted our steps, or they ensnared our steps*, that is, they were on the watch for us and caught us as a wily trapper watching the steps of his game, so that we could not go in our streets.—W. H. H.]—**Our end is near, our days are fulfilled; for our end is come.** [*Our end approached, our days were fulfilled, for (or yea, ja, GERLACH) our end arrived, or was actually come.* There is no change of tense from the first half of the verse.—W. H. H.] These are the *ipsissima verba* of the fugitives, which describe most graphically how they felt, when they observed that their flight was discovered. Since many survived those days, among others the king and the Poet himself, it is evident that these words are to be interpreted, not of what happened, but of what they feared would happen. Besides, the second half of the verse, composed of two members, is climactic; for in the first, the end is indicated only as near, but in the second as come, and therefore the measure of life as fulfilled. [These words were not the words of “fugitives,” for reasons given above. They may have been the words of the *would-be fugitives*, those who would have escaped from the city if they had not been arrested in the streets of the city. It is better, however, to regard them as the words of the Prophet. The Egyptians did not come to the rescue. Escape from the city was impossible. Then, says he, *our end approached, the days of our national existence were accomplished, yea our end actually arrived*, when the city was consumed with fire, and the people transported to Babylon.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 19. **Our persecutors are—our pursuers were—swifter than the eagles of the heaven.** The image of the eagles is taken from Jer. iv. 13, where it is said of the enemy from the north “his horses are swifter than eagles.” See 2 Sam. i. 23. Their apprehension proves to be well founded. The pursuit was begun instantly and with the greatest energy.—**They pursued us upon the mountains, they laid wait for us in the wilderness.** *On the mountains they chased us, in the wilderness they were on the watch for us* [GERLACH: *laid snares for us.*] It is to be observed that the way from Jerusalem to Jericho, at first over heights (beginning with the Mount of Olives) leads directly down into the plain of the Ghôr. See the full description of this road in RITTER’s *Geography*, xv. I, pp. 485 ff. Let the suffixes of the first person be carefully observed in this whole narration of the flight of the king, vers. 18-20. Would not one, who knew of the facts only by hear-say, have used the third person? And does not the first person show, as also the animated clearly defined particulars do, that he himself had participated in the flight from that fierce pursuit? [Granting that the flight and pursuit of the king are here intended, there is surely nothing in the description that necessarily implies the presence of the author with the king. But we have seen above that this verse cannot relate to the flight and cap-

ture of the king. The Prophet is simply relating the fate of the people and confirming his declaration that *their end*, as a people, a nation, *had come*, ver. 18. The Egyptians did not arrive for their relief. Those who ventured into the streets were seized and made prisoners. Those who managed to escape were hotly pursued or fell into ambushes carefully prepared in view of their flight. They were now hopeless and helpless. And to crown all, their king was a prisoner, ver. 20, and even if they could escape from their pursuers, they could not rally around his sacred person and preserve their independent sovereignty in some foreign land. Thus in very truth *their end had come*, which is the point the Prophet has in his mind.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 20. **The breath of our nostrils.** [OWEN: “A kingdom cannot exist without a king. Hence the king may be said to be the breath or the life of the body politic.”]—**the anointed of the LORD—of Jehovah—was taken in their pits**—[CALVIN: *in their snares.* BROUGHTON: *was caught in their trap.*]—**Of whom we said, under his shadow**—[or, according to OWEN and NOYES, *under whose shadow, we said,*—see Is. xxx. 2, 3; Hos. xiv. 8 (7); Ez. xxxi. 17.—**We shall live among the heathen**—[*the nations*, CALVIN, BROUGHTON, BOOTHROYD, OWEN, NOYES, GERLACH. BLAYNEY: “To live among the nations, probably means to exist in a national capacity, or as one among them.”] It is not the purpose of the Poet to sound the praises of the king. The literal meaning of the words and the connection utterly refute the idea, adopted by the Chaldaic, Raschi and many modern commentators, that this refers to the pious Josiah, whom Jeremiah, according to 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, glorified in a song of lamentation. The King here meant can only be Zedekiah. He was a weak, but a good-natured king. He resembled Louis XVI. of France. Like him he may also have been well-beloved. But the principal point was that he was king, and especially the theocratic king. SENECA says (*de Clementiâ*, i. 4, according to a quotation of PAREAU’S), *Ille (princeps) est spiritus vitalis, quem hæc tot millia (civium) trahunt* [he (the sovereign) is the vital breath, which so many thousands (of citizens) inhale]. Much more the theocratic king, the Lord’s anointed, the bearer of the promises (2 Sam. vii.) was a living pledge of the continuance and prosperity of the people. See Ps. xxviii., especially ver. 8, and DELITZSCH on that place. We can see, besides, from the words of *whom we said, etc.*, what plan with reference to the future was entertained by the fugitive Jews. They hoped to escape to a friendly heathen nation, and there gathering around their king as their shield and security of a better future, pass their days at least in freedom. [WORDSWORTH: “It has been objected by some, that the Lamentations could not have been written by Jeremiah on the occasion of the destruction of Jerusalem, because such words as these, could not be applied to such a vicious king as Zedekiah. But such an objection as this betrays an ignorance of the nature of true loyalty, as taught by Almighty God in the Old Testament, as well as in the New. He teaches us to distinguish the *person* of the sovereign from his *office*, and to venerate his *authority* as from God

* [Is this question well put by one who regards the third Song as the composition of another than Jeremiah himself?—W. H. H.]

(Rom. xiii. 1-7), whatever may be his personal character. Even Saul was 'the Lord's Anointed,' and was revered and bewailed as such by David. See on 1 Sam. xxvi. 8, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam. i. 14, 16. And our blessed Lord and His Apostles teach us to obey a civil ruler, as God's deputy and vicegerent, in all things not unlawful, although that ruler may be a Tiberius (see on Matt. xxii. 21) or a Nero (see on Rom. xiii. 1-7; Titus iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13)." CALVIN: "God made David king, and also his posterity, for this end, that the life of the people might, in a manner, reside in him. As far then as David was the head of the people, and so constituted by God, he was even their life. The same was the case with all his posterity as long as the succession continued. . . . But we must observe that these high terms in which the posterity of David were spoken of, properly belong to Christ only; for David was not the life of the people, except as he was the type of Christ and represented His person. Then what is said was not really found, in its fullest significance, in the posterity

of David, but only typically. Hence the truth, the reality, is to be sought in no other but in Christ. And we hence learn that the Church is dead, and is like a maimed body, when separated from its Head. . . . In short, Jeremiah means that the favor of God was, as it were, extinguished when the king was taken away, because the happiness of the people depended on the king, and the royal dignity was as it were a sure pledge of the grace and favor of God; hence the blessing of God ceased, when the king was taken away from the Jews. . . . *We shall live, they said, even among the nations under the shadow of our king;* that is, 'Though we may be driven to foreign nations, yet the king will be able to gather us, and his shadow will extend far and wide to keep us safe.' So the Jews believed, but falsely, because by their defection they had cast away the yoke of Christ and of God, as it is said in Ps. ii. 3. As then they had shaken off the heavenly yoke, they in vain trusted in the shadow of an earthly king, and were wholly unworthy of the guardianship and protection of God."]

IV. 21, 22.

- 21 Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz: the cup also shall pass through unto thee; thou shalt be drunken, and shalt make thyself naked. The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion; he will no more carry thee away into captivity: he will visit thine iniquity, O daughter of Edom; he will discover thy sins.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 21.—**וְשִׂיחָה**. For the form see Jer. x. 17. [May we recognize a peculiarity of Jeremiah in this form?—W. H. H.] **שִׂיחָה**, see i. 21.—**כֹּס**, Jer. xxv. 15, 17, 28; xlix. 12; li. 7, etc. The expression **תַּעֲבֹר־כֹּס** is peculiar to this place.—**שָׁכַר**, *inebriari*, Jer. xxv. 27; xlviii. 26; li. 7, 39, 57.—Hithp. of **עָרָה** only here. Jeremiah uses the verb in no form. Perhaps there lies in **תַּתְּעָרִי** an allusion [ironical?] to that **עָרָה** of the Edomites, Ps. cxxxvii. 7.

Ver. 22.—The perfects in this verse indicate, that the Poet transfers himself into the future, in such a manner that he sees what is yet future, as if it were actually transpiring before him.—**עֵינִי**, see ver. 6.—**הֵם**, frequent with Jeremiah, i. 3; vi. 29; xxiv. 10, etc. The phrase **הֵם עֵינִי** occurs only here.—Jeremiah uses Hiphil of **הָנִל** very often, xx. 4; xxii. 12, etc.: also the Piel, see ii. 14, where the construction with **עָל** also occurs.—**פָּקַד**, Jer. v. 9, 29; xxv. 12, etc. The phrase **פָּקַד עֵינִי** is a characteristic of the Pentateuch, Ex. xx. 5; xxxiv. 7; Lev. xviii. 25; Num. xiv. 18; Deut. v. 9: yet it is also found in Jeremiah, xxv. 12; xxxvi. 31.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 21, 22. In conclusion the Poet addresses a word of threatening to Edom, in the midst of which a word of comfort addressed to Zion, renders the severity of the threatening still more impressive. That the Edomites most maliciously rejoiced in the destruction of Jerusalem, and even contributed towards it, we know from Ps. cxxxvii. 7; Ez. xxv. 12; xxxv. 15; xxxvi. 5. See remarks on Jer. xlix. 7-22, to which the ironical **וְשִׂיחָה**, *rejoice and be glad*, here refer.

Ver. 21. Rejoice—*exult*—and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz. Whether this refers to an extension of the dominion of Edom that existed at

that time, or at an earlier period, or whether it merely refers to such an extension in a general way, is very questionable. EWALD (on this text and *Gesch. d. B. Isrl.* IV. S. 9) is of the opinion, that Nebuchadnezzar had extended the dominion of the Edomites "in the land of Uz far to the north-east." But this position of the land of Uz [north-east of Idumea] is very problematical. See remarks on Jer. xxv. 20. At all events, the words are most easily explained if the dwelling in the land of Uz is regarded as an evidence of success and a cause for rejoicing on the part of Edom. The historical accounts are too sparse to enable us to ascertain anything on this subject with certainty. See CARL VON RAUMER, *Eastern Palestine and the land of Edom*, in BERGHAUS' *Annals*, 1830, Vol. I pp. 563, 564. [Broughton: "From Essay, to the Herods Edom hated

Jacob, and no less than ten prophecies are against them, as BARBINEL noteth upon Obadiah." CALVIN: "The Idumeans, above others, had manifested hostility to the chosen people. And the indignity was the greater, because they had descended from the same father, for Isaac was their common father; and they derived their origin from two brothers, Esau and Jacob. As, then, the Idumeans were related to the Jews, their cruelty was less tolerable; for they thus forgot their own race, and raged against their brethren and relatives."—**The cup also shall pass through unto thee—also to thee shall the cup pass over.** [CALVIN: "He employs a common metaphor; for adversity is denoted in the Scripture by the word *cup*; for God, according to His will, gives to drink to each as much as He pleases. . . . Nor does He allow any one either to reject the cup offered, or to throw away the wine, but He constrains him to drink and to exhaust to the very dregs as much as He gives to each to drink. Hence it is for this reason that the Prophet says now that the *cup would pass over* to the Idumeans; for we know that, shortly after, they were subdued by the Chaldeans, with whom they had before been united. But when they had by their perfidy fallen off from their treaty, they were in their turn punished"].—**Thou shalt be drunken. Thou shalt get drunk.** [By drunkenness here we are to understand "that judicial infatuation" (BLAYNEY) which leads to all sorts of shame and self-injury, and exposes its subject to the cruel mercies of his enemies.—W. H. H.].—**And shalt make thyself naked.** Drunkenness and denudation, intoxication and shame go together: see Gen. ix. 21; Hab. ii. 15, 16.

Ver. 22. **The punishment of thine iniquity** (marg. simply, *Thine iniquity*) **is accomplished.**—*Blotted out is thy guilt* [or we can translate Dr. NAEGELSBACH'S translation, *Thy debt is paid, Getilgt ist deine Schuld.* GERLACH: *thy guilt is at an end.* All the English translators, except OWEN, take עָוֹן in the first member of the verse as the *punishment of iniquity*, and in the second member as *iniquity* itself. OWEN translates the word *iniquity* in both members, but explains the first as meaning punishment: "to complete iniquity," he says, "can here mean no other thing than to complete the punishment due to it." It is an awkward confusion of terms and injures the antithesis between the two members of the verse to put two meanings on this one word. We are, doubtless, to take the word in both clauses in the sense of guilt, desert of and liability to punishment, and understand the whole verse as intended in a prophetic and anticipatory sense. The exile the Jews were now suffering would exhaust, as it were, the demands of justice against them; and in view of this the Prophet says, *Thy guilt is blotted out, or cancelled, or at an end.* WORDSWORTH: "Rather, *thy sin* (see ver. 6) *is accomplished, completed and taken away; and for this use of the verb (tâm) here, see iii. 22; Jer. vi. 29; xlv. 12; where it is rendered by consumed, and GESEN. 867.*"—W. H. H.].—**He will no more carry thee away into captivity—he will not banish thee longer** [lit. *he will not add to banish thee.* This does not imply, as many commentators seem to apprehend, a promise that God would never again send the

Jewish nation into captivity. But it means only that their present exile should not be prolonged beyond the limit determined by their guilt. It involves rather a promise of a return to their own land, when their iniquity was thus cancelled by the punishment received.—W. H. H.].—**He will visit thine iniquity—He visits thy guilt.** See i. 8.—**O daughter of Edom, he will discover—he uncovers—thy sins.** The two halves of the verse correspond to each other: each of them has the name of a nation for its central point; to the עֲוֹןָךְ, *finished or cancelled is thy guilt*, of the first half, corresponds the בִּקְרָ עֲוֹנֶךָ, *he visits thine iniquity*, of the second; and to the הַגְלִיתִיךָ, *to banish thee*, of the first half, corresponds the גִּלָּה, *uncovers*, of the second.

[This is more apparent in Hebrew, because the last two words referred to are derived from the same verbal root. Some have attempted to make the correspondence complete by giving the same sense to both these words. Thus BOOTHROYD translates the first *he will no more expose thee*, and the second *he will expose thy sins*. But the Hiphil form of the first phrase will not allow us to translate it in the same sense as the Kal form of the second word, nor does the Hiphil ever seem to be used in any other sense than that of *leading away, causing to go away, driving away, or carrying captive.* HENDERSON, on the other hand (BLAYNEY and OWEN give the same sense), translates the first phrase *he will no more hold thee captive*, and the second *he will carry thee away captive because of thy sins*, which agrees with the marginal reading in our English Bible. But the Kal might mean to *go away into captivity*, but cannot have the Hiphil sense of *carrying away*. More than this, the grammatical construction would require us to understand that he made their *sins* captive instead of their *persons*. And more than all the Hebrew phrase is constantly used in the sense of *uncovering sins*, for the purpose of exposing them to contempt, rebuke and punishment. For these reasons it seems necessary to acquiesce in the translation above given.—WORDSWORTH: "He hath uncovered the sins of Edom; and hath covered those of Israel."—W. H. H.]

*Note on Authorship.** It seems to me that this Song contains some hints in reference to its author that are worthy of consideration. 1. The brilliant descriptive sketch of the Princes of Judah, given by the Poet in ver. 7, should be considered. 2. He charges the blame of the prodigious misfortune entirely to the Priests and Prophets, vers. 13-15 (see also ii. 14), whilst it appears from Jeremiah that the secular leaders of the people [die weltlichen Grossen] were not less guilty. See Jer. ii. 26; v. 5, 25-28; xxiii. 1, 2; xxxiv. 19; xxxvii., xxxviii. xlv. 17. His way of putting things conveys to us the impression, that the author may have been an accomplished member of the lay aristocracy, possessed of great love for his own particular order. 3. This conclusion is favored by the fact, as he gives us very plainly to understand, that he was

* [This note, appended to the introduction to the chapter by the author, has been transferred to the end of the chapter by the Translator, in order to preserve the connection unbroken.—W. H. H.]

one of the companions of the king in his flight, vers. 17-20. It would seem then, that he was one of the polished and well-disposed Princes belonging to the Court of the King. Was he, perhaps, that Seraiah, who was the son of Neriah and brother of Baruch (Jer. li. 59)? [The arguments here indicated have been already sufficiently answered. It remains only to say, 1. That Jeremiah was fully equal to a much fuller and more "brilliant" description of the princes, than that contained in ver. 7, both from his personal knowledge of the court, and his imaginative, poetical and rhetorical abilities, as exhibited in his book of Prophecies. 2. The author, even supposing him to be one of the Princes, can not be charged with the criminal partiality of attempting to throw a veil over the sins of his own peers. While ver. 13 charges special guilt on Prophets and Priests, as also Jeremiah (himself both Prophet and Priest) does; yet the whole people are represented as given up to sin, like the inhabitants of Sodom of old, ver. 6; and the 1, with which ver. 6 begins, shows that the secular nobility, represented in ver. 5 as those who "fed delicately" and were "brought up in scarlet," suffered the punishment of their own "iniquity." If it could be shown that the book of the prophecies of Jeremiah, written by a Prophet and Priest, sought to extenuate the guilt of those two classes and to lay the blame chiefly on the secular nobility, then there might be some show for the argument that this Book of Lamentations, which lays the onus of the guilt on Prophets and Priests, was not written by Jeremiah. But the very opposite of this is true: and in Jer. xxvi. 7-24, the Prophet actually represents the Princes as resisting the conspiracy of the Prophets and Priests, to put him to death. Who then would be more likely to show a preference for the Princes, to the other two orders alluded to, than Jeremiah himself? In fact, however, no such preference is shown. 3. Vers. 17-19 do not and cannot describe the flight and capture of the king and his army. If it were possible to interpret them of those events, we must decide that they are anything but "graphic," and have none of the characteristics which would mark the report of an eye-witness of those events and a participator in them. Only an author capable of the brusque personation of Jeremiah in the third chapter, by the abrupt introduction of "I am the man," could possibly be guilty of such an awkward and preposterous absorption of the king, princes, and "all the men of war" in his own person, by tumbling them all into the narrative condensed into the single pronoun "us," without any other announcement or the slightest intimation of the rank, character and numbers of those who now appear upon the scene. As Dr. NAEGELSBACH can accept the absurdity involved in the idea that Jeremiah was not the author of the third chapter, he can be pardoned for the absurdity involved in the idea, that the "us," in ver. 17 of this chapter, means king Zedekiah and his companions in flight, including "all the men of war." But where are the graphic features of the description, "die er so anschaulich beschreibt, dass man sich fast genöthigt sieht, ihn für einen Theilnehmer derselben zu halten," i. e., that there is no escape from the conclusion

that the writer was a participant in the scenes he describes? Where are the allusions to the facts that they escaped under cover of the "night," "by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king's garden," that "all the men of war" went with the king and that when the king was taken the army was "scattered from him" (2 Kings xxv. 3-5; Jer. lii. 6-8)? On the other hand, here are facts inconsistent with those referred to, that they were on their watch-towers, watching for help, not attempting escape, ver. 17, and that they could not go in the streets without being arrested by those who hunted their steps, ver. 18, involving the idea that the city was already in possession of the enemy,—whereas, before the enemy were actually in the city, Zedekiah and his army made a secret and unobserved escape, and were not pursued till after they had gone completely round the walls of the city from west to east and were on their way to the plains of Jericho. Finally: it should be observed that the completeness of the Poem requires us to interpret these last verses of the events that followed the capture of the king. They describe the last scene in the catastrophe, the feelings and the fate of the people, remaining in the city, when the Chaldeans took possession of it and proceeded to their work of plunder, violence and destruction. And it is written just as we would suppose Jeremiah, who was found in imprisonment by the Chaldeans, at that time, and who actually witnessed what he describes, would have written it.—W. H. H.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Ver. 1. "If the violation of a material Temple, such as that of Jerusalem formerly was, is so sad and sorrowful a spectacle; how much more sad and sorrowful would be the violation of spiritual temples, such as the bodies of Christians? Yet they are violated by other crimes against conscience, as well as especially by fornication and murders (1 Cor. vi. 15-20). But woe to such a violator! For he in turn shall be destroyed by the just judgment of God (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17)." FÖRSTER.

2. Vers. 1, 2. The children of Zion are here denoted as of noble extraction, and on that account compared to precious metals and precious stones, which never could become so black and vile, as to be thrown into the corners of the streets as worthless. Israel was in fact the nobility of the human race. For the heathen are nothing else than the *homo communis*, the ordinary natural man, without higher life-power. But Israel, as the chosen people, represented the power of the higher and eternal life, though only typically. Therefore it represents only, as it were, the lower nobility, or nobility in the lowest degree. Yet this is always a real nobility. The meanest Jew carries about with him to this day, in his crooked nose, a diploma of nobility, which elevates him above all the nobility of our modern European aristocrats, for he is thereby legitimized as a son of Abraham. But what is this and all other kinds of nobility of the earthly high-born, compared to the nobility of those born again of Christ through the Word and Sacrament? Nothing but "dung," as Paul decides,

who in Phil. iii. 8 tears his theocratic patent of nobility into shreds. For all that springs from the earth, is perishable, corruptible, subject to bondage (Gal. iv. 23-25); but what comes from Heaven, is incorruptible, eternal, glorious, truly free (Gal. iv. 26). Before that absolute nobility, moreover, all earthly distinctions vanish away; here is neither Jew nor Greek, here is neither bond nor free, here is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus (Gal. iii. 28). And on this account the Apostle speaks such earnest words against those who violate their Christian nobility (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 14-16).

3. Vers. 1, 2. "We are here reminded that there is no greater happiness on earth, than when Churches and Schools are built, in which God's pure word is preached and His worship duly and rightly observed; as on the other hand, there can be no greater evil than when all these are destroyed, wherefore Jeremiah here mourns first of all and most of all over such a destruction. And although Churches are not adorned with gold and silver, as the Temple at Jerusalem was, yet God's word and Divine worship rightly performed are more than all silver, gold and fine gold. To which purpose David says, The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times, Ps. xii. 7 (3): The law of Thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver, Ps. cxix. 72. Therefore we should look to it, that we do not by despising the divine word forfeit such a precious treasure, as did the Jewish people; on the contrary, loving God's word and observing diligently a pure worship and by the maintenance of pure doctrine, we should look to it, that the precious gold does not grow dim nor the fine gold lose its lustre." *Würtemb. Summarien*.

4. Ver. 2. "The Jews excelled in three respects: in profound and accurate knowledge of God (Ps. cxlvii. 20); secondly, in the beauty of a virtuous life (Sir. xlv. 6); thirdly, in careful observance of a pure worship (1 Mac. iv. 43)." THOMAS AQUINAS, in *Ghisler*, p. 176.

5. Ver. 2. "**Sons of Zion**, to wit of that looked-for city, which the Lord hath built, that it may be seen in its glory,—sons of the supernal Jerusalem, which is free, our mother; illustrious by the dignity of their condition; clothed in the primest gold, by their likeness to God. How then have we, who have become esteemed as earthen vessels, degenerated from these [Sons of Zion] into these vile and fragile bodies!" BERNHARD V. CLAIRV. in *Ghisler*, S. 177.

6. Ver. 2. "Let men of noble rank regard this as said to themselves, lest, because they are likened to gold on account of the celebrity of their family, they grow proud and imperious, but rather let them be persuaded to remember, that they are in the hands of the celestial potter (Sir. xxxiii. 13), who can easily transmute gold into earthen vessels, yea, and break these up into pieces (Ps. ii. 9)." FÖRSTER. [SCOTT: "The glory of outward distinctions and privileges may soon be obscured: Sin tarnishes the beauty of the most excellent gifts; and when the Lord leaves churches or nations, their 'glory is departed.' But that 'gold tried in the fire' which

Christ bestows, will never be taken from us; nor can its excellency be diminished."]

7. Vers. 3, 4. [SCOTT: "Extreme necessity has a tendency to render the heart callous and unfeeling: they who have improperly indulged their children when in prosperity, have often been most regardless of them in distress: and the human species has frequently been found more cruel and insensible, than the most ferocious and stupid of the irrational creatures."]

8. Ver. 5. "*Per quod quis peccat, per idem puni- tur et ipse*, that in which a man sins is the means of his punishment." FÖRSTER. [HENRY: "It is the wisdom of those who have abundance, not to use themselves too nicely, for then hardships, when they come, will be doubly hard, Deut. xxviii. 56."]

9. Ver. 6. "As the grace afforded us in the manifestation of the word of God is greater than that given to the inhabitants of Sodom, so is our impenitence more heinous, and severer punishment on that account is to be expected. So Christ clearly shows in Matt. xi. 20-24. Verily! we should not despise this thunder-clap; for it certainly applies to us, who are richly endowed with the gospel, but do not walk consistently with it or worthily of it, but its daily invitations, inducements, and warnings are given to the wind; thus, as the Prophet Jeremiah here says, The iniquity of my people is greater than the sin of Sodom, that was suddenly overthrown." EGID. HUNNIUS. "The sin of the people called of God is always the greatest, because it has most abused the revelation of God. Therefore is its punishment also worse than that of Sodom, which was suddenly destroyed, without suffering long torments from barbarous enemies. God often chastises us here longer than He does the heathen; but He does it to spare us the punishment which is eternal." DIEDRICH.

10. Ver. 6. "We are admonished here, that as there is disparity of punishments, so is there disparity [in the heinousness] of sins. Hence the paradox of the Stoics, who esteemed all sins equal, is shown to be false." FÖRSTER. "The iniquity of the Jewish people was rendered greater than the sin of the inhabitants of Sodom, because the latter transgressed only the law of nature, while the former transgressed both natural and written law." RHABANUS in *Ghisler*, p. 185.

11. Vers. 7, 8. This is an instructive example of the perishable and transient nature of all merely earthly splendor. What is there in all the beauty, wealth, and pomp of the young noblemen and their wives and daughters! Can there be a finer picture of the aristocrat's condition than we read here in the seventh verse? Is not the difference between the common race of man and the nobly bred placed here before our eyes in the distinctest manner? Yet, it is seen from ver. 8, that if our Lord God has only hung the bread-basket above their reach, the bodies of princes make no better show than those of burghers and peasants. From which we learn that there is no essential difference between them.

12. Ver. 7. "Kings and Princes, their courts and courtiers appear, now-a-days, just the same as they were long ago portrayed in David's Psalms, in the Ecclesiastes and Proverbs of

Solomon, and in the Wisdom of Sirach. What we say of them now in German, Latin, or French, is just what was said long ago in Hebrew or Syriac." DOCTOR LEIDEMIT, p. 43.

13. Ver. 9. "Four principal judgments are especially enumerated by the Prophet Ezekiel in his fourteenth chapter; namely, War, Famine, Pestilence, and Wild-beasts. Of these, Famine is by no means the least, but by far the greatest and most severe, so that here, in the Lamentations, it is said, That it may have been better for those killed by the sword than for those who perished through hunger. But this is not meant of hunger that happens by chance, or is the result of natural causes alone, but we must regard scarcity and starvation as God's rod (Deut. xxviii. 23, 24)." EGID. HUNNIUS.

14. Ver. 10. If mothers cooked their children, this was an unnatural crime, only to be explained as the effects of blind madness. But had not Israel also, against its better nature, forgotten the Heavenly Father (Is. i. 2-4)? [HENRY: "This horrid effect of long sieges had been threatened in general, Lev. xxvi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 53, and particularly against Jerusalem, in the siege of the Chaldeans, Jer. xix. 9; Ez. v. 10. I know not whether to make it an instance of the power of necessity, or of iniquity; but as the Gentile idolaters were justly given up to vile affections, Rom. i. 26, so these Jewish idolaters, and the women particularly, who had made cakes to the queen of Heaven, and taught their children to do so too, were *stript of natural affection*, and that to their own children. Being thus left to *dishonor their own nature*, was a righteous judgment on them for the dishonor they had done to God."]

15. Ver. 11. "The Lord accomplished His fury upon Jerusalem, when her wickedness was full, just as the sins of the Amorites were, when they were destroyed (Gen. xv. 16). He did, indeed, pour out (*effudit*) the fire of His indignation, but it was only when she (Jerusalem) had abandoned herself (*se diffudit*) to the commission of all sorts of vices and crimes; and He devoured her foundations, when she had refused to accept the foundation, which is Christ. Truly she rejected Him, the precious, square stone, laid at the foundation of our whole structure: Who, when He saw this same unhappy Jerusalem, wept over her, saying, that in her not one stone should be left upon another (Matt. xxiv. 2)." PASCHASIUS in *Ghisler*., p. 192.

16. Ver. 11. [CALVIN: PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that as Thou showest by Thy Prophet that, after having long borne with Thine ancient people, Thy wrath at length did so far burn as to render that judgment above all others remarkable,—O grant that we may not, at this day, by our obstinacy or by our sloth, provoke Thy wrath, but be attentive to Thy threatenings, yea, and obey Thy paternal invitations, and so willingly devote ourselves to Thy service, that as Thou hast hitherto favored us with Thy blessings, so Thou mayest perpetuate them, until we shall at length enjoy the fullness of all good things in Thy celestial kingdom, through Christ our Lord. Amen."]

17. Ver. 12. "The Holy Ghost here teaches us that there is on earth no city so secure, no kingdom so powerful, no stronghold so impreg-

nable, that it may not be destroyed by sins and unrighteousness (as by the strongest battering-rams, CRAMER). On that account, to trust in strongholds is idle, and is rebuked and condemned by the Holy Ghost." EGID. HUNNIUS. "The heathen princes themselves had not before this believed that such a calamity could happen to Jerusalem, for they regarded it with a certain feeling of awe, because they had an inward testimony that the true God had prepared there a place for His manifestation." DIEDRICH.

18. Ver. 13. "The Holy Spirit further teaches us here what a corrupt condition ensues in the whole spiritual theocracy, when those quit the right path of the only true, genuine service of God, who should most of all keep to it, namely, the teachers among the people, who should be to them those whose lips should preserve instruction, and out of their mouth should be sought the law of the Lord of Sabaoth. When they let God's word and pure instruction slip, the people are well-nigh done for. Then follow all the preposterous things which Jeremiah here indicates by the mention of false Prophets and bloody-minded Priests." EGID. HUNNIUS. [CALVIN: "This passage teaches us that Satan has from the beginning polluted the sanctuary of God, by means even of sacred names; for the prophetic office was honorable—so also was the sacerdotal. God had established among His people the priesthood, which was, as it were, a living image of Christ; there was then nothing more excellent than the priesthood under the Law, if we regard the institution of God. It was also a singular blessing that God promised that His people should never be without Prophets. As then Prophets and Priests were two eyes, as it were, in the Church, the devil turned them to every kind of profanation. This example then reminds us how much we ought to watch, lest empty titles deceive us, which are nothing but masks or spectres [phantoms]. When we hear the name of Church and pastors, we ought reverently to regard the office as well as the order which has proceeded from God, provided we are not content with naked titles, but examine whether the reality also corresponds. Thus, we see that the whole world has, for many ages, degenerated from true religion; under what pretext? even this,—that those who led astray miserable souls boasted that they were the vicars of Christ, the successors of the apostles, so that they still arrogantly boast of these titles, and are inflated with them. But we see what happened in the time of Jeremiah. . . . Prophets and Priests had destroyed the very Church of God."—WORDSWORTH: "This sin of the Priests and Prophets of Jerusalem, who conspired against Jeremiah, and slew other servants of God, reached its height when they murdered the Just One; see the words of Christ, Matt. xxiii. 31, 37; and of the first martyr, Acts vii. 52; and of St. Paul, 1 Thes. ii. 15; and those of James the Just, who himself was murdered by them at Jerusalem, Jam. v. 6."]

19. Ver. 13—15. "Thence follows the most pernicious corruption, and from that again the persecution of the really true doctrine and of its faithful followers and servants. . . . This is always the way and character *ecclesie malignantium*, that is to say, of the congregation and faction of

malicious hypocrites, inquisitors and conspirators, that they, from perverted love for their preconceived error and prejudice, are excited and inflamed by instigation of the evil spirit with such bitter hatred against pure doctrine and its faithful defenders, that they begin to maintain their error with fist and sword, and to persecute the churches of God, and thus sprinkle themselves with the blood of the righteous, to shed which they incite others, and give them counsel and help thereto. . . . Further, as those priests, in Jeremiah's time, covered over and adorned all their falsehoods and tyranny with the pretence of the succession and of the titles and names of the church, on which account they cried out against Jeremiah, *Templum Dei, Templum Dei*, 'here is the Temple of the Lord, here is the temple of the Lord, here is the Temple of the Lord' Jer. vii. 4; and, again, Jer. xviii. 18, 'Come, let us devise devices against Jeremiah; for the law shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the Prophet;' so in our day, the constant everlasting cry, with the Pope and his crowd, that they shout against us, is—Church, Church, Church! The Pope cannot err in the faith and articles of religion, for he is a successor of St. Peter, and sits in his chair. Yet the church of God is not so bound to the external succession or order but that those, who certainly were in the orderly external succession of the Levitical priesthood, established by God Himself, in Jeremiah's time, and also in Christ's, wandered far, far away from the truth, and those who sat in Moses' seat, namely the Scribes and Pharisees, became the bitterest enemies of our Lord Jesus Christ and of His chosen, holy church (Matt. xxiii.). What then may not happen in the case of the Pope, who can, without difficulty, prove that God in the New Testament proposes to have a Pope who shall exalt himself over all, but in fact, through St. Paul, has designated such a Primate of the Papacy as an unfailing sign of the Antichrist? (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4)." EGID. HUNNIUS.

20. Vers. 13, 14. "Such to-day are the sanguinary priests of Rome, and especially the Jesuits, who wish to be esteemed priests κατ' ἐξοχήν. . . . Hence those famous emblems of theirs (Jesuitæ in Censura Coloniensi, Fol. 136): 'If LUTHER had been removed before his fortieth year by fire or sword, or if others were removed from the midst of us, the whole world would not be confounded by such abominable dissensions.' In accordance with these sentiments are those of Andrew Fabricius Leodius, Counsellor of the Princes of Bavaria, in his Preface to the Harmony of Augustine's Confessions, 'Let our most mighty emperor gird his sword upon his thigh, and subdue these heretics, the most pernicious enemies of the Christian name. The shedding of Lutheran blood is useful, for by that means the members are preserved entire.'" FÖRSTER.

21. Vers. 13, 14. "When God has in view the purification and reformation of an ecclesiastical constitution, dependence is, least of all, to be placed on Theologians by *profession*, and their assistance and support, or even only their comprehension and assent. When the economy of the Old Testament came to an end, the Priests and Scribes were the bitterest enemies and persecutors of

Jesus and His doctrine, the stupidest in the whole world to understand the Scriptures which testified of Him. HUSS and other witnesses for the Truth, were adjudged to the funeral-pile, not by the laity, but by their own colleges and professional associates. How was it in this respect in LUTHER's time? The Princes and laity were always more just, more tolerant, more easily convinced of the truth, more prepossessed in its favor, than the Bishops, the Scholars and the clergy generally." Doctor LEIDEMIT, p. 44.

22. Ver. 15. [HENRY: "They upbraided the corrupt Priests and Prophets, with their pretended purity, while they lived in all manner of real iniquity. You were so precise, you would not touch a Gentile, but cried, *Depart, depart, stand by thyself, I am holier than thou*, ls. lxv. 5. Thus the prosecutors of Christ would not go into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled. But can you now keep the Gentiles from touching you, when God has delivered you into their hands? When you fly away and wander, . . . these serpents will not be charmed or enchanted . . . no, they will not respect the persons of the priests, nor favor the elders."—SCOTT: "The wickedness of those who are by office engaged to support religion, and yet betray her interests, is the great cause of national judgments, and of the ruin of flourishing churches: especially when they have shed the blood of the just in the midst of them. They who have thus polluted their garments, have commonly been recompensed in the same way; and rendered an execration even to the vilest of mankind."]

23. Ver. 17. "Hence appears the truth of David's apothegms in Ps. cxviii. 8, 9; cxlvi. 3, 4; with which accords Jer. xvii. 5; as well as the Son of Sirach, vi. 7-9, where, on the margin, LUTHER wrote these beautiful rhymes,

Freunde in der Noth
Gehen 25 auf ein Loth.
Sollt's ein harter Stand sein,
Gehen 50 auf ein Quintlein." FÖRSTER.

"Pious people should, according to this, avoid putting their trust in men, as a great sin and a species of idolatry, and all the more because all such trust in men leads us into danger, finally disappoints us and covers us with shame. For men either wish not to help us, or when they are willing they cannot, or when they promise it, they do not keep their promise, for their very nature is vanity. Hence David takes occasion to dissuade us from trusting in men or gazing after them, when he says in Ps. lxii., Men are only vanity; men of high degree are wanting, they weigh less than nothing, whatever they may be." EGID. HUNNIUS.

24. Ver. 18. "Here occurs a proof text concerning the fatal end and period of affairs, which is decreed, as our text bears witness, to cities and nations,—nay to all things in the universe (Eccl. iii., Sir. xiv. 20), but above all to individual men (Job xiv., Ps. cxxxix. 16). That end depends indeed on the foreknowledge of God, but not simply and absolutely on that foreknowledge, but as that foreknowledge is directed with regard to second causes, especially with reference to piety and impiety, as is attested both by the promises of God, such as that added to the fourth

[fifth] commandment (Eph. vi. 2, 3), and by His threatenings, Ps. lv. 24 (23). Hence it appears, that the end of human life is not so definitely ordained as by fate, because it can be prolonged by the practice of piety, and shortened by the practice of impiety." FÖRSTER.

25. Ver. 19. [CALVIN: "When the hand of God is against us, we in vain look around in all directions, for there will be no safety for us on mountains, nor will solitude protect us in the desert. As, then, we see that the Jews were closed up by God's hand, so when we contend with Him, we in vain turn our eyes here and there; for, however, we may for a time entertain good hopes, yet God will surely at last disappoint us."]

26. Ver. 20. In the Sept. the verse reads: *The Spirit of our countenance, Christ the Lord was taken in their destruction* (συνελήφθη ἐν ταῖς διαφθοραῖς), of whom we said, *In his shadow will we dwell among the nations.* JEROME translates, *The Spirit of our mouth, Christ the Lord, was taken in our sins, to whom we said, In thy shadow will we dwell among the nations.* It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that this passage was regarded by the ancients generally as one of the most decided Messianic prophecies. "This text," says GHISLER., "was very frequently quoted by the early Fathers, and was interpreted by their common consent of Christ the Son of God." A collection of the various patristical expositions may be found in GHISLER. They make chiefly a threefold use of the text. 1. TERTULLIAN proves from it against PRAXEAS (cap. 14), that the Father could in no sense have been a *facies* [form or manifestation] of the Son, but, on the contrary, the Son was a *facies* [manifestation] of the Father. 2. They recognize in this passage a clear prediction of the sufferings of Christ. Thus, for example, THEODORET says, "Let the Jews say, Whom does the word of prophecy call Christ? Who of those called Christs by them, whether king, or prophet, or priest, has been named Lord (κύριος)? But they could not point to such an instance, although they made use of much falsehood. It is evident, therefore, that the Prophet foretold as the Saviour and our Lord (κύριον), Him who has been taken by them through the destruction of their impiety." [THEODORET adapts his language to that of the Septuagint (see above), συλληφθέντα παρ' αὐτῶν διὰ τὴν τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν διαφθοράν.—W. H. H.] 3. But they find also the calling of the Gentiles predicted in this text. ORIGEN, particularly, says this (Hom. on Cant. ii. 3) with reference to Luke i. 35, "If, therefore, the overshadowing of the Most High attended the conception of His (Christ's) body, it is reasonable that His shadow shall give life to the Gentiles."

27. Ver. 20. "The question arises, how could these titles (*Messiah, breath of the people's nostrils, shadow*), apply to the wicked king Zedekiah? They apply to him, not by reason of his personal character, but 1st, by reason of his office, which ought to have been, and was expected by the Hebrews to be what these titles import. 2d. By reason of the Antitype, of whom David, with his posterity, in his kingly office was a type. But who is this Antitype? Our Lord Jesus Christ, the son of David according to the flesh (2 Tim. ii., Rom. i.), that anointed one of the Lord (Luke

ii. 26), whose breath is in His nostrils (Is. ii. 22), and who is our shadow against the heat of God's wrath (Is. xxv. 4), and to whom the Lord God gave the throne of His Father David (Luke i. 32, 33). Magistrates are here admonished both of the authority and the functions of their office. They, too, can be called by that name of authority—the anointed of the Lord. And the functions of their office are, that they may be, by their counsel and efficient aid, the *breath of the nostrils*,—and such a *shadow* as that prefigured in the tree in Dan. iv. 7-9 (10-12)." FÖRSTER.

28. Ver. 21. "Here is a proof-text concerning ἐπιχαιρεκακίᾳ, rejoicing in the misfortunes of others, from which crime Christians, of all men, should be furthest removed. For those who delight in the misfortunes of others, stripped of all humanity, no longer imitate the tastes and dispositions of mankind, but those of the devil." FÖRSTER.—Cup. FÖRSTER remarks here that the figure of a cup is used metaphorically in three ways. 1. Cup denotes the misfortune of the righteous as well as that of the ungodly, Ps. lxxv. 2. It denotes the good or bad fortune of the righteous, Ps. cxvi.; Matt. xx. 22; xxiii. 39, 42; Mark x. 38; John xviii. 11. 3. It denotes the misfortune of the ungodly, Is. li. 17, 22; Jer. xxv. 15; Lam. iv. 21; Ez. xxiii. 31; Hab. ii. 16; Rev. xiv. 10; xvi. 19.

29. Ver. 21. "We learn from this that God has filled their certain measure of trouble for all men, and He lets the cup pass round and no one is overlooked, as it is written in Ps. lxxv., The Lord has a cup in His hand, and fills it full of strong wine, and pours out from the same, but the ungodly must drink up the dregs. That is, the pious must also drink of the cup of wormwood, sorrow and pain. But Christ has presented for them the forestated cup of such a bitter, sour potion, and with the wood of His cross has made sweet and tolerable for His own to drink the bitter waters of Mara, as is beautifully and figuratively represented in Ez. xv. 23-25. But the ungodly must at last taste the lees and dregs of God's wrath, which potion constitutes their final and utter ruin." ERIC HUNNIUS.

30. Ver. 22. **He will no more carry thee away into captivity.** "Here it is, indeed, averred, that the Lord would not after this again cause the people to remove from the land, which certainly seems to conflict with the prolonged exile which the Jews at this day are enduring. But the answer is easy and obvious, from the rule commonly accepted by Theologians: All God's promises are to be understood as having the condition of penitence annexed to them." FÖRSTER.

31. Vers. 21-22. "Zion's punishment will sometime have an end, because God in spite of all His judgments upon His people, will yet fulfil His kingdom; the punishment of Edom, on the contrary, and of all maliciously disposed worldly powers, is eternal and without hope. Heathendom, as such, cannot be regenerated, notwithstanding all God's judgments; it can only perish, because it has not God's word. But the greater is God's punishment of His people, the more sure is His plan for their salvation. That same Christ, who said, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me,' and sweat blood, yet most cer-

tainly was and continued of His own accord and by His own act in the bitterest agony of death and in the deepest humiliation, and He has brought to light our eternal victory, for as many of us as abide in faith on His word, however helpless at present we may be in ourselves. Christ is our life and our strength." DIEDRICH.

32. Ver. 22. [CALVIN: PRAYER. "Grant, Almighty God, that as Thou seest that at this day the mouths not only of our enemies, but of Thine also, are open to speak evil,—O grant that no occasion may be given them, especially as their slanders are cast on Thy holy name; but restrain Thou their insolence, and so spare us, that though we deserve to be chastised, Thou mayest yet have regard for Thine own glory, and thus gather us under Christ our Head, and restore Thy scattered Church, until we shall at length be all gathered into that celestial kingdom, which Thine only-begotten Son our Lord has procured for us by His own blood. Amen."]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. Vers. 1-6. *The destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans an example of God's great and impartial righteousness.* 1. Israel was among the nations, what gold is among the metals and precious stones are among minerals, vers. 1, 2. 2. But the sin of Israel was greater than the sin of Sodom, ver. 6. 3. Therefore the punishment of Israel was severer than that of Sodom, vers. 3-5.

2. Vers. 7-11. *The relation of spiritual hunger to physical.* 1. The relation as it should be. *a.* Both are sanctioned, Matt. vi. 11, 32; 1 Tim. vi. 8. *b.* But spiritual exigency should have the preference, Matt. vi. 33; iv. 4; xvi. 5-12; Jno. vi. 27, 32-35. 2. The relation as it should not be, Luke xvi. 19-31. 3. The consequences of the perversion of the right relation. *a.* With regard to physical hunger, Lam. iv. 7-11. *b.* With regard to spiritual hunger, Amos, viii. 11, 12; Rev. ii. 5.

3. Vers. 12-16. The warning, which John Baptist gave to the Jews, *Begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our Father* (Luke iii. 8), concerns all persons and communities, in this day, who believe that they are assured of their Divine vocation. How well grounded this warning was, could be shown at that time by a reference to the first destruction of Jerusalem. Let us avail ourselves of the same fact in order to impress the solemn truth, *that no Divine vocation can save us from eventual destruction.* For, 1. Israel's vocation was (*a*) attested by the promises given to the Patriarchs; (*b*), confirmed by many proofs of actual Divine interposition in their behalf; (*c*), recognized even by the heathen. 2. This vocation was not unconditional, as carnal Israel imagined. 3. The non-fulfilment of the conditions, for which the Priests and Prophets were chiefly guilty, ensured as a conse-

quence the judgment of the first destruction. Conclusion: What befell Israel, the natural olive tree, may much more readily befall that which is only an engrafted branch (Rom. xi. 12) of the same.

4. Vers. 12-16. *The great responsibility of those possessed of spiritual authority.* 1. The duty is imposed upon them, of directing the people by word and example to keep the conditions on which the Divine promises have been given. 2. To them belongs the guilt, if by their neglect, the people find the curse instead of the blessing.

5. Vers. 17-19. *Human help is useless.* For, 1. It, is by itself, impotent. 2. Those who depend upon it, (*a*), experience the pain of disappointed expectation; (*b*), they come to a terrible end.

6. Ver. 20. *The reciprocal duties of rulers and subjects.* 1. The duties which subjects owe to their rulers. It is to be observed, that the Prophet, "in this text confers an honorable title on the ungodly king Zedekiah, that he calls him the Anointed of the Lord, and here a beautiful lesson is taught us, with what respect we should regard and speak of our superiors and rulers, and honor in them the office, which God has conferred upon them, even if in personal character they are wicked and ungodly." 2. The duties which rulers owe to their subjects. Let them remember that their "office, in the words of the Prophet, should be, next to God and under God, a refuge under whose shadow their poor subjects may live." EGID. HUNNIUS

7. Vers. 21, 22. *The reciprocal relation of those who suffer and those who take pleasure in the sufferings of others.* 1. That one, who first has suffering, will afterwards have joy, if he bear his suffering in the right way. 2. That one, who first has malicious pleasure in the sufferings of others, will at last have sufferings himself, (*a*), because he has calumniated God by the presumption that He was not influenced by love in His punishments; (*b*), because he has been destitute of love to his neighbor and thereby has provoked against himself the sentence of retaliation (Mark iv. 24).

8. Ver. 22. [HENRY: "1. An end shall be put to Zion's troubles. *The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion.* The troubles of God's people shall be continued no longer, than till they have done the work for which they were sent. 2. An end shall be put to Edom's triumphs. *He will visit thine iniquity, O daughter of Edom.* It is spoken ironically in ver. 21, *Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom.* This is a good reason why we should not insult over any who are in misery, because we ourselves also are in the body. But those who please themselves in the calamities of God's church, must expect to have their doom, as aiders and abettors, with them that are instrumental in those calamities. Sooner or later, sin will be visited and discovered."]

CHAPTER V.

DISTRESS AND HOPE OF THE PRISONERS AND FUGITIVES: [EXPRESSED IN THE FORM OF A PRAYER;
OR, E. V., A PITIFUL COMPLAINT OF ZION IN PRAYER UNTO GOD.—W. H. H.]

- VER. 1. Remember, Jehovah, what has come upon us!
Look down and see our reproach.
- VER. 2. Our inheritance has fallen to strangers,
Our houses to aliens.
- VER. 3. We have become orphans, without father,
Our mothers—as widows.
- VER. 4. Our water we have drunk for money,
Our wood comes for a price.
- VER. 5. On our necks we have been pursued;
We have been weary,—there was no rest for us.
- VER. 6. Towards Egypt have we stretched the hand,—
Towards Assyria,—to be satisfied with bread.
- VER. 7. Our fathers sinned. They are no more;
We have borne their iniquities.
- VER. 8. Servants have ruled over us:
There was none to deliver from their hand.
- VER. 9. At the peril of our lives we get our bread,
Because of the sword of the desert.
- VER. 10. Our skin has been parched as an oven,
Because of the ragings of hunger.
- VER. 11. Women in Zion have been humbled,—
Virgins—in the cities of Judah.
- VER. 12. Princes have been hung up by the hand:
The persons of Elders have not been honored.
- VER. 13. Young men have carried mill-stones;
And boys have fallen under [burdens of] wood.
- VER. 14. Elders have forsaken the gate,—
Young men—their music.
- VER. 15. Ceased has the joy of our heart;
Our dance has been changed to mourning.
- VER. 16. The crown has fallen from our head.
Woe unto us! for we have sinned.
- VER. 17. For this our heart has become faint;
For these things our eyes have become dim.
- VER. 18. As to Mount Zion, which has become desolate,
The foxes have walked upon it!
- VER. 19. But Thou, Jehovah, reignest forever;
Thy throne is from generation to generation.
- VER. 20. Wherefore should'st Thou always forget us,
And abandon us for length of days?
- VER. 21. Turn us, Jehovah, unto Thee, and we shall turn;
Renew our days as of old;—
- VER. 22. If Thou hast not utterly rejected us,
And art wroth against us exceedingly!

ANALYSIS.

The subject is chiefly composed of the particular incidents of those grievous days which followed the capture of Jerusalem. The Poet lets the people speak, yet not as an ideal female person, but in the first person plural as a concrete multitude. The Song is divided into an introduction. ver. 1, two principal parts.

vers. 2-7, 8-16, and a conclusion, vers. 17-22. In the introduction, ver. 1, the Lord is entreated to regard the sorrows that had befallen Zion [the people]. In the following two principal parts, vers. 2-16, these sorrows are described in detail. The first part embraces vers. 2-7. All their property, fixed and movable, is seized by the enemy, ver. 2; families are scattered, fathers have disappeared, mothers are as widows, ver. 3; the captives receive no subsistence, they must buy what they need, though as the product of their own land it is really their own property, ver. 4; on the march to Babylon, they are driven beyond their strength, and no rest is allowed them, ver. 5. Besides all this, the whole people do not even remain together. Whilst one party is compelled to throw itself into the arms of the Egyptians, another party belongs to Assyria; both are in such straits as to rejoice if able only to prolong their lives, ver. 6. But this great misfortune is caused by the sins of the fathers, the consequences of which now their posterity have to bear, ver. 7. The second principal part embraces vers. 8-16. Whilst those forced to Babylon groan under the rods of the rough servants, who are their drivers, ver. 8, those who wander to Egypt, must seek for subsistence amidst constant danger from the robbers of the desert, ver. 9; both parties suffer the consuming pangs of hunger, ver. 10. To this is now added a recital, partly the recollection of what had already been endured, partly an exhibition of what they still experienced, of the sufferings from which no class of the population was exempted: women have been dishonored, ver. 11; noble princes hung up or outrageously ill-treated, ver. 12; young men compelled to carry heavy hand-mills, and boys loads of wood, ver. 13. Sitting in the gate—the delight and glory of old men, and playing on stringed instruments—the pleasure of young men, have come to an end, ver. 14. In general, among all classes, deep mourning has succeeded to pleasure and joy, ver. 15. The crown of glory has fallen from the head of Zion, and, verily, those who suffer this, are obliged to acknowledge, that it has happened, not merely because their fathers had sinned (ver. 7), but because they themselves have sinned, ver. 16. The conclusion contains a prayer, to which vers. 17, 18 are introductory. In these verses it is declared, that all the affliction of the Israelites culminates in the destruction of the Sanctuary. But this thought suggests the encouragement, which the Poet now presents in his prayer; although the external Sanctuary is destroyed. Thou Thyself, O Lord, remainest for ever, ver. 19. Wherefore shouldst Thou forget and forsake Thy people for ever? ver. 20. Lead us back to Thyself, that we may be again what we have been in former times, ver. 21. This will be done, for it is not to be supposed, that Thou canst have utterly rejected us, ver. 22. [Ver. 1, introductory; vers. 2-10, descriptive of general suffering from oppression and want of necessities of life; vers. 11-13, instances of individual suffering; vers. 14-18, effect on the feelings and sentiments of the people; vers. 19-22, the prayer.—W. H. H.]

PRELIMINARY NOTE ON CH. V.

This chapter is not acrostic. Yet it is evident from the agreement of the number of the verses with the number of the letters of the alphabet, that the chapter should be regarded as belonging to the four preceding ones as a member of the same family. The acrostic is wanting, because the contents are in prose. The Poet would make apparent, even in the external form, the *decrecendo* movement, which we perceive from the third chapter onward. Were there not 22 verses, this chapter might be regarded as an entirely disconnected supplement. But the number of verses is a vinculum, that in a way even externally observable, unites this prosaic chapter with the preceding poetical ones.

[Various reasons may be given for the absence of the acrostic in this chapter.* 1. There may be something in the notion that the alphabetical structure was not allowed to embarrass freedom of thought and expression in prayer (GERLACH, ADAM CLARKE). 2. We may suppose the writer felt less need of the artificial restraint in controlling his feelings and restricting their expression. It is not true that this Song "is of less impassioned character" than the others, as WORDSWORTH says, but it is true, as he further says, that "the writer, being less agitated by emotions, and having tranquillized himself by

the utterance of his sorrow, and by meditations on the attributes of God, did not need the help of that artificial appliance to support and control him." Besides, new restraints are imposed upon the writer in this Song, which more than supply any assistance derived from the alphabetical curb in the preceding songs. The verses are reduced from three and two members each, to a single member, and this not only balanced by a cesura or pause as in the other songs, but composed of corresponding parallelisms of ideas and expressions. To have added, to the production of these distinct and emphatic parallelisms, the difficulties of the acrostic, could have served no useful or artistic purpose. 3. In the last fact referred to, the introduction of parallelisms of thought and sentiment, may be found the most satisfactory reason for the absence of the acrostic. As long as the parallelisms were merely rhythmical, as in the first four songs, the alphabetical index served a good purpose in rounding off and defining the successive verses. Now it is no longer needed. We find here then an argument in favor of the theory advanced, in Additional Remarks to the Introduction, p. 23, in reference to the relation of the Acrostic to rhythmical parallelisms.

Is this chapter poetry or prose? Dr. NÆGELS-BACH says, "the acrostic is wanting because the contents are in prose."* He certainly cannot mean that the chapter is prose, because th:

* [The opinion of BERTHOLF, that the Prophet "either had no more time to spend in the troublesome choice of initial words, or that he grew tired of this trifling process and deliberately relinquished it," (quoted by GERLACH in his Intr. p. x.), is sufficiently refuted, not only by its own irreverence, but by what has been said in reference to the acrostic in Additional Remarks to Intr. pp. 23, 24.—W. H. H.]

* [We cannot misunderstand our author, for besides speaking of this as a "prosaic chapter" and comparing it with the preceding "poetical chapters" (see also Intr. pp. 3, 4, 5), he puts his new translation into good German prose—while he has given us most beautiful metrical translations of the other four chapters.—W. H. H.]

acrostic is wanting; and yet unless he implies this, he has not even suggested a reason for this most extraordinary assertion. This chapter has poetical characteristics, that the preceding chapters do not possess; besides having all that they do possess, except the acrostic, which in itself is unpoetical. 1. It has that unflinching mark of Hebrew poetry, of which the preceding chapters are nearly destitute, parallelisms of thought, one half the verse exactly and beautifully corresponding in its sentiment and form of construction to the preceding half, and successive verses connected by underlying analogies, comparisons, or relations, such as parallelisms involve. 2. The language is so unmistakably rhythmical as to be almost metrical. The first line of each verse never consists of more than four words, nor of less than three, counting compound words as one. The second line never consists of more than three words (unless in two instances, where

אל ver. 12, and ו or נ ver. 16, may be joined to the word following them), and if it have two words only, those two are in that case invariably long words. In this song, if anywhere in Hebrew poetry, we can detect evidences of such metrical feet as the Hebrew language was capable of. 3. There is throughout the Song such *assonance* as cannot be accidental, and could only be allowed in poetry. The Song is full of rhymes. This may not justify us in calling it a "strictly rhymed Song" (as does BELLERMAN, *Metr. d. Hebr.*, S. 220, quoted by GERLACH), but it is certainly a result of the evident regard to *assonance* in the choice of words. Thus in this Song that is composed of only 44 short lines, א occurs 55 times, and 44 times as final letter of words; ד occurs 21 times as final letter of words: out of the 134 words the Song contains, 65, or only 2 less than one half, end in either א or ד. 24, or more than half of the lines, end with א, 17 end with ד, 9 end with ב. In 9 verses (1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17) both lines end with the same letter (or letters) and vowel point. 28 lines end with the same letter that terminates one (or both) of the lines of the verse immediately preceding or following. Other evidences of a studied *assonance* are apparent: such as אב, כְּנוֹת, as terminations of ver. 3; אֶצִּינִי, יִבְרִינִי, first words in the lines of ver. 4; כִּפְנִי as first word in second lines of verses 9, 10, making a parallelism in sound as well as in sense; שָׁבַת, שִׁבְתָּ, in near relation and parallelism, vers. 14, 15, and possibly an equivalent for failure of rhyme in ver. 14; לִפְנֵי, as last word in first lines of vers. 15, 17; etc. So obvious is the prevailing paronomasia in this Song, that the remark has been made, that the Song appears like 'the effort of a youth playing with words' (quoted by GERLACH). To the slur contained in this remark, it may be replied, that no unskilled youth, even if capable of choosing his words so artfully, could have arranged them so as to give both harmony and sense, and thus produce a poem equal in fervor, force and beauty to this. But the fact that such an insult could be offered to this Song, proves that it is written in a style only adopted in poetry. 4. In spirit as well as in form, this

chapter is poetry, and that of the highest order. There is nothing prosaic about it, not even in the recital of hard facts and detailed incidents. As the Song proceeds the lyre is tuned to higher chords than even inspired minstrels often reach, and vers. 14-19, are so exquisitely beautiful that we cannot imagine anything to excel them in all the Songs of Heaven and earth. I cannot repress the expression of these sentiments and be a silent instrument in giving to American readers, this strange opinion of an eminent man, that this chapter is a bit of prose writing, tacked on to a splendid poem, by the poor expedient of its containing twenty-two verses (though it is something new to write prose in verses). Were I more diffident of my own judgment, I might take refuge under the shadow of DEAN MILMAN, who in culling from the Lamentations what he regards as specimens of "the deepest pathos of poetry," gives us a metrical translation of nearly the whole of the 5th chapter (14 out of the 22 verses), while he selects only three verses from chap. i., eight verses from chap. ii., three verses from chap. iv., and none from chap. iii. It is to be inferred that in his judgment, the fifth Song excels in its poetry the four Songs that precede it. I agree with him.

That the only connection of this chapter with the preceding four chapters is found in the corresponding number of its verses, without which it might be regarded as a supplement to those chapters, but not as an integral part of the Poem, is an opinion that will not sustain examination. 1. It is, as we have seen, lyrical in its structure, and thus assimilated to the preceding Songs. 2. The Poem could not end with the fourth chapter. Such an ending were too painfully abrupt. Even as it is, the burden of Edom seems to be intruded at that place, and we only comprehend it, when we know that it was Jeremiah's habit to represent the security of the church of God, by depicting the destruction of its enemies. But to end the Poem with that threat against Edom, would seem to be impossible. Something more is needed, and that something is just what we have in the prayer of chap. v. 3. The only way to account for the omission of the usual prayer (see i., ii., iii.) at the end of the 4th Song, is by the fact that its omission was to be more than supplied by the 5th Song. Here is the groove into which the fifth Song is dovetailed so securely, that we cannot break the connection, without marring the harmony and completeness of the whole poem. 4. The structure of this last Song, gives the last needed touch to the manifest unity of the whole poem. The preceding chapters may be regarded as composing a poem not unlike the modern ode, in which great liberties in the versification are allowed. But the Ode, complete in its main parts, is wound up at last with a Hymn of prayer to God, constructed according to the strictest rules of lyrical poetry, metrical and harmonious, and forming an apt conclusion because it recites all that has been before said, briefly and forcibly,—sums up, as it were, the whole case, and leaves it in the hands of God. Finally Dr. NAEGLSEBACH's beautiful fiction of a *crescendo* and a *decrecendo* movement, does not need the flattening out of the Poem into a piece of prose writing, attached to what precedes only by

the number of its verses. It is enough that the *decrecendo* movement, in the music of the Poem, is arrested at the close, and the Poet's most plaintive lyre pours forth a final strain of impassioned, yet melting and delicious harmony.—W. H. H.]

V. 1.

1 Remember, O LORD, what is come upon us: consider and behold our reproach.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 1.—יָזַכְרִי. See Is. xxxviii. 3; Mic. vi. 5; Job iv. 7.—יָזַכְרִי. See i. 11. [BLAYNEY: "Forty-one MSS. and four Editions read with the Masora יָזַכְרִי, with the הַ paragogic." HENDERSON: "The הַ thus added to the Imperative, expresses the emotion of ardent desire on the part of the speaker."] חֲרַפְתָּנוּ. See iii. 30; Ps. lxxiv. 22; lxxxix. 51.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. Remember, O LORD, what is come upon us,—Remember, Jehovah, what has befallen us,—consider and behold—look and see—our reproach.—[The word translated consider (see i. 11), when followed by רָאָה, to see, means to direct attention to a thing in order to see it. BLAYNEY and NOYES translate, Look

down and see—which gives the sense, but the word does not express *direction*, but the intensity of looking.—W. H. H.] This first verse constitutes the introduction. It contains the prayer, that Jehovah would regard the affliction and reproach fallen on Zion [the people], some features of which the Poet recounts in what follows. The Poet presents himself before God, as it were, and all that follows is to be regarded as addressed to God.

V. 2-10.

2, 3 Our inheritance is turned to strangers, our houses to aliens. We are orphans
4 and fatherless, our mothers are as widows. We have drunken our water for money;
5 our wood is sold unto us. Our necks are under persecution: we labour, and have
6 no rest. We have given the hand to the Egyptians, and to the Assyrians, to be
7 satisfied with bread. Our fathers have sinned, and are not: and we have borne
8 their iniquities. Servants have ruled over us: there is none that doth deliver us
9 out of their hand. We gat our bread with the peril of our lives, because of the
10 sword of the wilderness. Our skin was black like an oven, because of the terrible
famine.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 2.—נִחְלָה, frequent in Jeremiah, ii. 7; iii. 19; xii. 7-9, etc.—נִחְפָּן, see i. 20; iv. 6. Jeremiah uses in this sense נִכְבַּן, vi. 12. This word represents the transfer of property to another owner, in Is. lx. 5 also.—זָרִים Jeremiah uses frequently, i. 25; iii. 13; v. 19, etc.—נִכְרִים. Jeremiah uses only once, in the fem., נִכְרִיָּה, ii. 21.

Ver. 3.—יָתוֹס, Jer. v. 28; vii. 6, etc.: in Lamentations only here.—אֶבֶן. See Is. xlvii. 1; Jer. ii. 32; my *Gr.*, §106, 3. [אֶבֶן=ohne, without, NAEGLS. *Gr.*] The K'rî, אֶבֶן, is unnecessary.

Ver. 4.—כִּימִינוּ, Jer. vi. 7; xlv. 7; i. 38.—כֶּכֶף, Jer. vi. 30, etc.—עֵצִים, Jer. v. 14; vii. 18, etc.—מִחֵיר, Jer. xv. 13.—יָכַף. EWALD translates, *our wood is sold for silver*. He also takes כֶּנֶף in the sense of the Latin *vénéo, vénire*. But I do not think that כֶּנֶף is ever used in this sense. At the most, only 1 Kings x. 14 could be cited, where the word is used with reference to the revenues.

Ver. 5.—צֹאֵר, see i. 14.—רָרַךְ, Jer. xix. 18; Lam. i. 6: in the sense of *driving, chasing*, the word is not elsewhere found in Jeremiah. [It is doubtful if that is its sense here.—W. H. H.]—יָגַעַת, Jer. xlv. 3, which place is very closely allied in sense to our place here, li. 58.—הִוָּנַח. The Hophal is found only here: Jeremiah uses only the Hiphil הִנִּיחַ, xiv. 9; xxxvii. 11; xliii. 6.

Ver. 6.—מִצָּרִים אֲשׁוּר are to be taken as *Acc. localis*, in answer to the question *whither?* See my *Gr.*, §70, b. [There is no necessity of supposing an ellipsis of the preposition לְ, as HENDERSON; nor any grammatical reason for translating, *O Egypt, O Assyria*, as BLAYNEY does, diverting the prayer from God to these heathen nations.—W. H. H.]—שָׁבַעְתָּ, see iii. 30.

Ver. 7.—אֵנָם. Four times in this chapter, the Masorites would read י, where it is wanting in the *Ms.*, vers. 3, 5, 7

twice. But the author generally uses Vav sparingly. Only once is the second clause of the verse begun with $\vee$. In this verse, an error might arise from its use. If it were $\vee$ וְאֵינֶם , some would be led to understand their non-existence, as the consequence of their sinning. See Jer. x. 20. But this cannot be the author's meaning; for he immediately asserts that the generation now living has to bear the punishment. Their being no longer in existence, therefore, is the simple result of the course of nature. כָּבֵל Jeremiah never uses. It represents bearing the burden of sin, Is. liii. 4, 11; comp. xlv. 4, 7.— עֵיִן , see ii. 14.

Ver. 8.— מִשָּׁל , Jer. xxii. 30; xxx. 21, etc.— פָּרֶק , see Gen. xxvii. 40; Ps. vii. 3; cxxxvi. 24; Jeremiah never uses the word, neither does it occur again in the Lamentations.

Ver. 9.— בְּנִפְשָׁנוּ (נ) *pretii*, see my *Gr.*, § 112, 5 a). See i. 11; 2 Sam. xxiii. 17; 1 Chron. xi. 19.— הָבִיא , see i. 21. [We have the future here, as the historical imperfect, implying the recurrence of what is related.—W. H. II.]— לָחֶם , i. 11.— חֶרֶב הַדְּפַבֵּר , which can only indicate the robber tribes of the desert (Gen. xvi. 12), is found only here. [CALVIN translates הָרֵב , drought, and wonders that any one ever thought of calling it sword. It may have the meaning of drought in Deut. xxvii. 22, though even there E. V. has sword. In this verse, all the Versions, and commentators generally, translate sword.—W. H. II.]

Ver. 10.— כָּבֵר occurs only in Niphal, and besides here only in three places, Gen. xliii. 30; 1 Kings iii. 26; Hos. xi. 8. The sense is *caefactum, adustum esse* (see חָכַר , i. 20; ii. 11). The plural shows that עוֹר is regarded collectively. [It also shows the preference in this Song for termination in י . Yet, "fifty-eight MSS., and the Soncino Bible read עוֹרֵינוּ in the plural" (HENDERSON).—W. H. II.]— עוֹר , see iv. 8.— הָנִיר , see Hos. vii. 6, 7, is not found in Jeremiah, [nor any equivalent for it.—W. H. II.]— זֶלַעַפּוֹת , *astus vehemens*, Jeremiah never uses. It is found, besides here, only in Ps. cxix. 53; xi. 6.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[Vers. 2-10 describe the distressed condition of the people generally, and especially the sufferings caused by deficiency in the necessities of life. Vers. 2, 3, describe their disinherited and bereaved condition.—W. H. II.]

Ver. 2. **Our inheritance is turned to strangers, our houses to aliens—foreigners.** [CALVIN: "The land had been promised to Abraham four hundred years, before his children possessed it; we know that this promise had been often repeated, 'This land shall be to you for an inheritance.' . . . No land has ever been given to men in so singular a way as the land of Canaan to the posterity of Abraham. As, then, this inheritance had been for so many ages possessed by the chosen people, Jeremiah does not without reason complain that it was turned over to aliens."—Our houses to aliens. Many expositors (VAHINGER for instance) understand from the second clause of this verse, that not all the houses of Jerusalem had been destroyed, but those which still remained were at the disposal of the Chaldeans; which is the same as saying that they dwelt in them. They appeal to 2 Chron. xxxvi. 19, where the destruction of the palaces only is spoken of. Although in Jer. lii. 13; 2 Kings xxv. 9, it is expressly said that *all the houses of Jerusalem were destroyed*, yet, they say, this is to be regarded as merely a rhetorical hyperbole, since elsewhere the houses of the great [the nobility] are alone specified. Compare Jer. lii. 13. We have, however, no evidence that the Chaldeans inhabited Jerusalem after its destruction; and Nehemiah (ii. 3) mourns that Jerusalem *was desolate*, and its gates burned with fire.

When it is said here that the houses were given up to the Chaldeans, this can only mean that they disposed of them as they pleased. In fact, they destroyed the houses, but carried away the movable property found in them as booty. Although the houses and their contents could be designated as an inheritance, yet by נַחֲלָה , *inheritance*, which

is here distinguished from the houses, the land is especially intended (see Lev. xx. 24; Num. xvi. 14; xxxvi. 7-9; Jos. xiii. 23; etc.). We may say,

therefore, that נַחֲלָה , *inheritance*, and בָּתִּים , *houses*, are related to each other substantially as fixed and movable property.

Ver. 3. **We are orphans and fatherless—we have become orphans, fatherless [without a father, CALVIN, BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, NOYES, GERLACH]—and our mothers are as widows.** That the first words cannot be understood exclusively of the loss of their own fathers, is evident from the expression *as widows*. PAREAU is of the opinion that *widows and orphans* indicate, in a general way only, as a proverbial formula, *tritissimam sortem* [a very sad lot], and appeals to Is. i. 17; Ps. xciv. 6; James i. 27. But in all those places, widows and orphans in the strict sense of the terms, are to be understood. THENIUS understands by the *mothers*, the wives of the King, who were with the little company among whom our song originated. But even if we allow, that as some of the Princesses of the royal family, according to Jer. xli. 10, escaped transportation, so also may some of the wives of the royal harem, yet we cannot suppose that the Poet indicated these as the *mothers* of himself and his companions, because they were not, in fact, their mothers, nor was it customary to call them so. EWALD refers *orphans and fatherless* to the loss of the sovereign (the father of his country, ii. 9; iv. 20) and of the theocracy, but *widows* to the communities and cities (i. 1). This is without doubt correct, as far as this, that *all* the Israelites had, in this respect, become fatherless and their mothers widows. But why might not the Poet, at the same time, have alluded to the fact, that in the prevailing confusion most of the mothers could not certainly know whether their husbands were dead or alive, and therefore it could be correctly said of them that they were "*as widows*" (see i. 1)? I believe, therefore, that ver. 3 embraces every species of orphanage that might have existed at that time. [There were so many orphans and mothers separated

from their husbands among the people, that a Poet might well exclaim, Behold in us a people composed of fatherless orphans, whose mothers are as widows! But the particle of comparison attached to the last word, *as widows*, suggests the probability that the whole verse is intended metaphorically. We are like fatherless orphans and our mothers like widows. This is GERLACH'S explanation.—W. H. H.]

[Vers. 4-10 relate to the general distress occasioned by the want of the necessities of life and the oppression of their masters.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 4. **We have drunken our water for money; our wood is sold unto us** (marg. *cometh for price unto us*). *Our water we drink for money; our wood comes to us for payment.* That the want of water *before* the capture of the city is not here intended, is evident from the expressions *our water, our wood*; for the prominence of this idea can only signify that the Jews were obliged to buy from their enemies the wood and water that were rightly *their own*; but this could have been the case only after the capture of the city. We perceive from the description, that the companies of the captives, in all cases narrowly watched, were not at liberty to go, at their own pleasure, to bring wood and water. But they were furnished, either with no provisions at all, or in insufficient quantities, so that in order to secure the necessities of life, they were obliged to apply to their guards, who made them pay dearly for the services rendered them. It appears further from this passage, that the Poet has here in his eye that period of the captivity when the captives were still in their own land, else he could not say "*our water, our wood*." There seems to be a rhetorical reason for the use of the perfect (נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה) in the first clause, and of the imperfect (נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה) in the second. For, grammatically considered, either the perfect or imperfect should be used both times, since the two acts are entirely homogeneous. But the Poet wished to bring variety into his period, perhaps also to avoid the clashing together of two tone-syllables, which would have happened, if it had been written נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה. He could introduce this variety, since the limit between these two verbal forms is a fluctuating one, determined by the subjective conception of the speaker. For, in many cases, the same action can be regarded as already completed and as still in progress. See for example

נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (Jos. ix. 8) and נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (Gen. xlii. 7), my *Gr.* § 84, 87. So here the drinking of water for money is represented by נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה as something accomplished, being constituted by many acts of drinking, but by נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה the fetching of the wood is represented as something not yet finished, something still continuing. We are at liberty to translate both tenses, so far as they are concerned, by the present or by the preterit. The context shows which the Poet intends. He evidently is describing the journey of the captives going into exile. But nothing indicates that he looks back upon it as already accomplished, that he would represent it as already terminated in the land of exile. Consequently, we are obliged to translate all the tenses, which refer to differ-

ent incidents of the journey, in the present. [There is a studied effort in this Song, as shown in the preliminary note to this chapter, to multiply words ending in י, ו, and we may add in ו.]

In the expressions "*Our water*," "*our wood*," the pronoun is added merely, if we may so say, for the sake of the rhyme, or, more correctly, the assonance, just as in ver. 9 he says, "*our bread*." The writer could legitimately gratify the ear by this expedient, for what they bought and used certainly became their own. It is obvious, therefore, that the meaning of the verse can not turn on the use of the word *our*. If this had been intended to be emphatic, and to represent the water and the wood as their property before they bought it, then this verse should have immediately followed ver. 2, where the transfer of their property to new owners is represented. Otherwise, the third verse intrudes a new idea between two thoughts that are closely related, the loss of their inheritance and houses, and the necessity of purchasing what had been their own property. If, on the other hand, we take our text as a simple statement of the fact that they were obliged to purchase such common necessities of life as water and wood, we are enabled to translate the preterit verb in the past indefinite time. The Prophet is by no means describing the incidents of the journey of the exiles from their own land. He is enumerating and heaping together *en masse* the various features of sorrow and suffering experienced by the unhappy people, without particular reference either to the time or place of their happening. Among other things that had happened was their having to pay money for the water they drank: and he uses the preterit tense, *We have drunken our water for money*,—this is among the things that had happened, perhaps once only, perhaps oftener; but there was another hardship of more frequent occurrence, one often repeated, and that may have continued down to the time when he wrote, and this he expresses, as the Hebrew so constantly expresses the recurrence of events even after they are past, by the future form of the verb, which we may render as an historical imperfect—*our wood came to us, or was coming*, that is, it came in that way only, *for a price*, or we may render it as a present—*it comes still only for pay*.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 5. **Our necks are under persecution** (marg. *On our necks are we persecuted*); **we labor and have no rest**. *We are driven headlong* [Ueber Hals und Kopf werden wir gejagt, lit. *over neck and head (over head and ears, as we say in English) are we driven*]; *are we tired, rest is not permitted us*. The Septuagint connects עַל צַוְּאֵנָהּ upon our necks, with what precedes, ξίλα ἡμῶν ἐν ἀλλαγᾷ ἡλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἡμῶν, our wood in exchange for our money came upon our neck. So also the Arabic version. The Syriac closes ver.

4 with בְּמַחֲוֶה and refers נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה to what follows, so that it also translates *venerunt super collum nostrum, they came upon our neck*, where either *ligna*, wood, or *hostes*, the enemy, may be regarded as the subject. Among the moderns, ABEN-EZRA and J. DAV. MICHAELIS also connect the phrase *upon our necks* with what precedes. The latter

gives the sense thus, *ligna nostra pretio empti cervicibus nostris imposita in urbem importantur*, our wood bought with a price and laid upon our necks is carried into the city. The explanation of the Syriac produces a very harsh zeugma in ver. 4, renders the following sentence unintelligible, and expresses a thought that may be termed at least unnecessary. The objections to the other versions are as follows. 1. *בְּכֶרֶךְ*, for pay, ver. 4 must be taken, either as dependent on a verb to be supplied (*emta*), or as belonging to *בָּנָוּ*, in the very unsuitable sense, that the Jews were paid for carrying the wood. 2. The symmetrical proportions of the verses are destroyed; ver. 4 is too long, ver. 5 too short. We will then follow the Masoretic division of the verses. But as thus arranged, this verse has undergone various interpretations. PAREAU translates *super cervicibus nostris inessores patimur*, we bear sitters [riders] upon our necks. *נִרְדָּפְנוּ* cannot mean we are ridden, or we carry riders. As little can it mean naturally, we bear persecutors or oppressors, which would correspond with PAREAU's idea, only without a figure. Others (RASCHI, DE WETTE, EWALD, 1st ed., MEYER, VAHINGER, ENGELHARDT) translate on our necks the yoke, or the yoke on the neck are we persecuted. But as THIENUS has remarked, the yoke here is a superadded idea entirely arbitrary. [BLAYNEY reads *עַל*, yoke, instead of the preposition *עַל*, upon. But we must then, as he does, take the verb in a sense it cannot have of being burdened with, *With the yoke of our necks are we continually burdened*; or, as BOOTHROYD does, supply the preposition on and the verb is, and make an independent proposition of the first two words, *The yoke is on our necks, we are pursued*; or, as NOYES does, supply two prepositions, *With the yoke upon our necks, we are driven*.

HENDERSON, without changing *עַל* into *עַל*, thinks that upon our necks we are persecuted expresses "elliptically the great hardship to which the Jews were reduced in being compelled as captives to bear a heavy yoke on their necks;" and translates, *We are persecuted with a yoke on our necks*. So WILLIAM LOWTH seems to understand the text and refers to Deut. xxviii. 48. "We are driven to our work like the bullock that has a yoke about his neck" (ADAM CLARK).—W. H. H.] All these explanations fail in this that they let *עַל* depend, not immediately on *נִרְדָּפְנוּ*, but very unnecessarily on an entirely different idea supposed to be concealed therein. THIENUS and EWALD (2d ed.) have perceived the right sense, when they translate, on the neck were we pursued (so EWALD: THIENUS expresses the same sense by the words, *they pursued us over our necks*, i. e. since they are ever close behind us). I translate, *We are driven on over our necks*, that is to say, so that the driving goes over our necks onwards—and this idea corresponds exactly with our German phrase, "über Hals und Kopf" [lit. over neck and head, i. e. headlong]. LUTHER: "über Hals." [In full: *Man treibt uns über Hals.*] Besides, *נִרְדָּפְנוּ* cannot be taken in the sense of *pursuing*, for not fugitives, but captives are here spoken of, who are already in

the hands of the enemies and are driven onward without mercy. This appears plainly from vers. 5, 8. The meaning to *drive*, to *chase*, undoubtedly lies in the root *נִרְדָּפְנוּ* (see the kindred roots *נִרְדָּף*, *נִרְדָּף*, and is as plain as daylight in such places as Lev. xxvi. 36 (the sound of a falling leaf shall chase them), Job xxx. 15; Is. xvii. 13. [It would be a relief to accept Dr. NÆGELSACH's simple explanation, and translate, *They drove us*, or *we were driven headlong*, or as we would say in our colloquial English, *heels over head*, but there is no evidence that the Hebrew words are used in any such colloquial sense. The next best thing is to adopt the translation of MAURER, THIENUS, EWALD, OWEN and GERLACH, which Dr. NÆGELSACH also approves of, *On our necks were we pursued*, i. e. our pursuers followed us so closely as to be, as it were, on our necks. "We are hunted by pursuers who are ever hanging over our neck" (WORDSWORTH). The objection to taking the verb in the sense of *pursuing*, on the ground that the people are here considered as *captives* and not *fugitives*, grows out of the incorrect interpretation of ver. 4, and involves an entire misconception of the intention of this Song. It is not the design of the Prophet to give a detailed account of successive and related events, but to heap up together, in one rapid and vehement recapitulation, all the wrongs, indignities and sufferings the people had endured, without reference to times or places.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 6. Whilst the Poet describes the onward march of the larger part of the people to the land of banishment, he is reminded that the people are, by this means, still more widely separated and torn asunder; for one part, by far the smaller part, has been compelled to turn southwards towards Egypt. [This verse confirms the opinion that the Prophet is not relating successive events in the order of their occurrence and in their relations to each other; but is stating independent facts and instances, all of which contribute to present to God an appeal for pity and mercy. There is no close connection, therefore, between vers. 5, 6, such as OWEN and GERLACH would find, when they say that ver. 6 relates what they did when so closely pursued. According to Dr. NÆGELSACH's interpretation, that ver. 5 refers to the Jews on their way to Babylonia, driven before their captors, the connection of ver. 6 is impossible. While they were so closely pursued that their pursuers were on their necks, did even a small part of them miraculously escape and flee to Egypt? Dr. NÆGELSACH does not mean to assert this; but his theory of interpretation would seem to demand it.—W. H. H.]—**We have given the hand to the Egyptians, and to the Assyrians to be satisfied with bread.**—*Towards Egypt stretched we the hand,—Towards Assyria,—in order to be satisfied with bread.* To stretch out the hand can mean here only, to stretch out the hand as a suppliant; see Jer. l. 15; 1 Chron. xxix. 24. [CALVIN: "To give the hand, is explained in three ways: some say that it means humbly to ask; others, to make an agreement; and others, to extend it in token of misery, as he who cannot ask for help, intimates his wants by extending his hand.

But the Prophet seems simply to mean that the people were so distressed by want, that they begged bread." But in what sense did the Jews stretch out the hand to *Assyria*? They had submitted to this great power, not willingly, as they had thrown themselves into the arms of the Egyptians, but by compulsion. Yet they must, if they would live, stretch out their suppliant hand, to receive a morsel of bread from the hand of Assyria bestowing it upon them. But what power is intended by Assyria? It has been understood of Assyria strictly speaking, which carried the ten tribes into exile. But it would be strange, indeed, if the Poet here overlooked the Babylonish exile. That he says *Assur*, and not *Babel*, may be explained on the ground that he has in mind the Assyrian, as well as the Babylonish captivity. While *Babel* never stands for *Assur* and *Babel*, the name *Assur* is so used as to embrace both countries; see 2 Kings xvii. 24; xviii. 11; xxiii. 29; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11. The brief words of our text exhibit also the fact, that Israel no longer existed as a nation, but was entirely given over to the power of the kingdoms of this world, on whose favor its very life depended; and, while the smaller part found itself in the power of Egypt, the larger part, which included both Israel, carried away into Assyrian exile, and Judah, deported to Babylon, is subject to *Assur*,—to *Assur* in the widest sense of the term, understanding thereby, not only Assyria in the strict sense, but Babylon also. See also Jer. ii. 18. [*Noxēs* is of the opinion that *giving the hand*, imports submission, as in Jer. l. 15; to stretch out the hand to be bound, as it were. Thus, he remarks, "in 2 Chron. xxx. 8, what is translated in the common version *yield yourselves unto the Lord*, is in the original *give the hand to the Lord*." The context here, nevertheless, favors the idea that the Jews were reduced in many instances to abject beggary, and entire dependence for the necessities of life on these heathen nations, the greatest enemies their country had.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 7. Our fathers have sinned and are not; and we have borne their iniquities.—*Our fathers have sinned: they are not; we bear their sins.* [There is no sufficient reason for rendering the last verb as a present. The English version is more literal.—W. H. H.] Comparing this verse with ver. 16, a certain parallelism is observable. In both the sins of the people are asserted to be the cause of the calamities previously described. But ver. 7 says, *Our fathers have sinned and we bear their guilt*. Ver. 16, on the contrary says, *Woe to us, we have sinned*. Here, as in i. 5, 8, 9, 14, 18; ii. 14; iii. 42; iv. 6, 12-14, the description of calamities endured constitute a principal feature in the confession of sin. As one paragraph ends with ver. 7, and another with ver. 16, ver. 8 begins a new paragraph. [This division separates verses closely allied. The subject down to ver. 10 is chiefly related to sufferings connected with the want of the necessities of life. With ver. 11 begins a description of individual instances of outrage and cruelty (vers. 11-14), followed by a description of the effects of all these calamities, public and private, on the theocratic people who offer the prayer. Ver. 16 is as intimately con-

nected with what follows, as with what precedes it.—W. H. H.] There is at least some truth in the assertion made in ver. 7. For the great catastrophe had been brought about, not only by the guilt of the last generation, but also by that of previous generations (Jer. iii. 25; xv. 4; xvi. 11, 12). But ver. 7, without ver. 16, would contain only a partial view of the truth. The two verses complete each other. [WORDSWORTH: "The sins of their forefathers were visited upon them, because they themselves had sinned, as they themselves confess. . . . There is, therefore, no reason for supposing, with some, that these words could not have been written by Jeremiah, being at variance with the doctrine in Jer. xxxi. 29."—**And are not** (אֵינֵם, without *they*, see GR. notes above; *they are not*.) These words connect themselves rather with what follows, than with what precedes. *Our fathers have sinned*. Whilst *they are no more, we bear their sins*.

Ver. 8. Servants have ruled over us: there is none that doth deliver us out of their hands.—[*None delivered from their hands.*] Who are these servants? Satraps are suggested. So say those who understand ver. 5 of the residence of a part of the people in Palestine or elsewhere. But we see from ver. 5, that the subject of discourse is the march of the actually exiled hosts. Satraps, it is true, are the king's servants, but they are not merely servants, they are not slaves. That men of distinguished descent and high rank should stand under Satraps was a reproach, when considered in a theocratic point of view, but not to be regarded as a matter of sufficient importance to be mentioned in this place. Besides, in fact Gedaliah ruled in Judea, himself a Jew and, according to the testimony of Jeremiah (xl. 7-12), a well-disposed man. But that real slaves were employed for overseers and drivers of the marching captives, this was certainly in the highest degree hard and likewise disgraceful. [This again is to be regarded as one feature of the great variety of sufferings that befell the people. It is not necessary to suppose that the whole people were at any time under the lordship of slaves or under-servants. It is not necessary to suppose an exclusive reference to the bands of captives that were driven to Babylonia. It is enough that in their degraded state it often happened that they had to submit to domineering and harsh treatment from men that were themselves menials.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 9. We gat our bread with—at—the peril of our lives, because of the sword of the wilderness. ROSENUELLER refers this verse to the dangers which the corn-transport *out of Egypt* may have had to encounter in the wilderness. But is it supposable that corn was brought from Egypt, when the larger part of the people had been led away to Babylon, and the smaller part had themselves fled to Egypt? EWALD, on the other hand, finds in these words "a remarkable indication, that most of the fugitives in Egypt dwelt at the north-eastern border close to the desert," and so were compelled "to wring their bread from the desert and its robbers." But when in the world was bread brought from the desert, even by those dwelling on the borders of Egypt, and not from

the interior of the country? THENIUS presumes that this Song was written amid the circumstances of one of those small companies that remained in Palestine and were scattered about in that land. These, falling in on their pasture-grounds with the warlike tribes sojourning among them, would be compelled to get their subsistence by fighting for it. But that supposition is confirmed neither by the history (observe Jer. xlii. 1, "all the people," etc.), nor by the contents of our Song (compare ver. 8 especially, with the opinion of THENIUS, that the little company, among whom the Song was written, preferred liberty in poverty, to dependence in prosperity, ver. 6). The view of VAHINGER rests on the same opinion, and differs from that of THENIUS only in this, that he understands the bringing of bread to refer to merchant travellers who were in peril from Bedouin robbers. I am of the opinion, that the expedition here indicated, was an incident belonging to the experience of those Israelites who had not been led away to Babylon, and especially of those who had fled to Egypt. It is allowable to suppose, both from general reasons and particularly from ver. 6, that this one of the two parts of the people is intended. Much is touched upon in the Song, that happened to all in common (vers. 2, 3, 7, 10-12); much that only befell those who suffered captivity (vers. 4, 5, 8); here (ver. 9) we have a description that suits only the condition of those fugitives to Egypt, who yet retained their freedom. But I refer the verse, not as EWALD to those already settled in Egypt, but to events and circumstances preceding their settlement. According to Jeremiah xli. 8, ten men bought their lives of Ishmael, the murderer of Gedaliah, at the price of provisions which they had hidden. From this we see that provisions were scarce and

that there were bands of robbers who hunted for them. Is it not then in the highest degree probable, that the crowd which fled to Egypt (Jer. xli. 16-18), both while they were still in Palestine, and frequently when they were in the desert, could obtain what was necessary for subsistence only at the peril of their lives?—[**We gat our bread.** Here again we have a future tense, נִנְּךְ; intimating the frequent recurrence, and doubtless the continuance, at the time of writing, of this peril.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 10. **Our skin was black like an oven.** [So BROUGHTON, CALVIN and HENDERSON. See Ps. lxxviii. 13.] *Our skin is burnt [has been burnt] like an oven.* [This sense is the one generally adopted, on the ground that it is more consistent with the effects of famine, and more congenial with the derivation and use of the Hebrew word. BLAYNEY and NOYES translate the verb *parched*.—W. H. H.]. The effect of hunger on the skin is compared to that of heat on the walls of the oven. Like these, that has become hot, dry, hard, cracked. There was hunger enough with the two parts of the people, who stretched out their hands, one to Assyria, the other to Egypt, until the one had arrived in Assyria and the other in Egypt.—**Because of the terrible** (marg. *terrors, or storms of*) **famine,—because of the heat (or hotness, Gluten) of hunger.** [Because of the burning (BROUGHTON) or burnings (CALVIN, NOYES). GERLACH translates the word *raging, or fury* (Wüthen), and so it is rendered by ALEXANDER (in Ps. xi. 6; cxix. 53, the only other places where the word occurs), who remarks, that "no English word is strong enough to represent the Hebrew except rage or fury." BLAYNEY translates *stormy blasts of hunger*, and HENDERSON *the hot blasts of famine*.—W. H. H.]

V. 11-13.

- 11 They ravished the women in Zion, and the maids in the cities of Judah.
12, 13 Princes are hanged by their hand: the faces of elders were not honoured. They took the young men to grind, and the children fell under the wood.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 11.—עָנָה, see iii. 33.—הִיחָדָה: עָרָה, see Jer. i. 15; iv. 16; ix. 10: and elsewhere very frequently.

Ver. 12.—תִּרְרָה is found nowhere in Jeremiah.—הָרָרָה Jeremiah never uses; see Lev. xix. 15, 32; Ex. xxiii. 3.

Ver. 13.—מִחֲלוֹן, *handmill*, is ἀπ. λει. See elsewhere מִחֲנוֹן Prov. xii. 4, and the verb Deut. xi. 8; Jud. xvi. 21; Is. xlvi. 2, etc. Jeremiah uses neither the verb nor the substantive.—כָּשַׁל with בָּ, Jer. vi. 21; Is. viii. 15; Lev. xxvi. 37.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[Vers. 11-13. The sufferings of individuals, of all ages and conditions, especially their degradation, are described. These verses still further confirm the opinion, that this Song belongs to no special time or locality, but that it is a general enumeration of the various evils the people had suffered, from the time when Jerusalem was invaded, to the time when the Prophet indited this Poem.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 11. In this and the following verses (to ver. 15) are described the sorrows which befell particular classes of persons at the capture of the city. These are incidents which partly belong to an earlier period of the history, and partly still continue in force. The violation of the women and the hanging up of the Princes are past events, but the pain they caused still survives.—**They ravished**—*dishonored*. [OWEN: "There is here a delicate word for a disgraceful act. The words literally are.—*Women in Zion they humbled* (or, *were humbled*). It

is humbled by the *Sept.* and *Vulg.*" They suffered not only the worst, but all sorts of indignities. —W. H. H.]—**The women in Zion and the maids—virgins—in the cities of Judah.** [BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON and NOYES translate the first word *matrons*. The Hebrew word is as generic as our word *women*. Besides, this transfers the antithesis from *Zion* and the *cities of Judah*, where it belongs, to the distinction between *matrons* and *maids*, which the parallelism does not require. The *women* generally were humbled, even in *Zion*, yea and throughout all the *cities of Judah*. CALVIN: "He mentioned *Sion* rather than *Jerusalem*,—it was indeed to state a part for the whole; but that place we know had been chosen by God that His name might be there worshipped. . . . As, then, God had there His palace, that He might dwell in the midst of His people, it was a disgraceful sight in the extreme to see women ravished there, for the temple of God was thus violated."—W. H. H.]

Ver. 12. **Princes are—were [have been]—hanged up—hung—by their hand** [*i. e.* suspended by the hand.—W. H. H.]. This has been explained in three ways. 1. The Princes hung themselves with their own hand. But since, according to Deut. xxi. 23, *he that is hanged is accursed of God*, this is incredible. Why could they not have killed themselves in some other way? CALVIN indeed surmises, that they were compelled to hang themselves. But would not this have been explicitly stated, if the Jews had been compelled to do it? 2. *At their side* [*i. e.* Princes were hung beside or near the cities (so EWALD), or at the side, or in near proximity to the humbled women]. But against this are (1) the masculine suffix, (2) and yet more the preposition *בְּ*,—it should be *לִידם* (1 Sam. xix. 3; Prov. viii. 3; 1 Chron. xviii. 17; xxiii. 28). Only two places can be named, where *בְּ* may stand for *לְ*, namely, 1 Sam. xxi. 14; Job xv.

23. But in the first passage it is, *וַיִּתְּחַלְלֵם*, he raved in or under their hands; and in Job xv. 23, the sense, as the connection shows, is—he knows that he himself (by his own hand) has prepared the day of darkness. Nothing else remains for us, therefore, but to translate, 3. *by their hand*, and to refer the suffix to their enemies. The sense, indeed, is somewhat feeble; but verbal and substantial arguments render this explanation necessary. [GERLACH adopts the same view. Besides the evident awkwardness of this construction, it is open to the very serious objection, that the enemies have not been mentioned in the preceding context, nor are they prominently in the mind of either writer or speaker. The preceding verse merely tells us that women in *Zion* and virgins in the cities of *Judah* had been humbled. But by whom? The natural inference is, by the public enemy. Yet this is not said; is not even inevitable, and if it were, the mind of the reader is occupied with the women who suffered, not with the men who inflicted the injury. The pronoun, if it refers to any subject in the preceding verse, must, it would seem, refer to the women, or possibly to the cities. But that it does not refer to either of these is evident from its gender, and from the

absence of any intelligible sense in which it can refer to them. We must conclude that it refers to the persons immediately named in close and preceding connection, and who according to all fixed rules of grammar, must be its subject. If this is so, then it can only mean either, what CALVIN says, that the Princes committed suicide, and that by hanging themselves, which as has been said is utterly incredible; or else, what the collocation of the words in the original naturally suggests, that *the princes were hung up, i. e. suspended, by the hand, or their hand*. The pronoun may properly be dispensed with, for its presence here seems entirely due to the preference of the writer for words ending in *בְּ*; it belongs to the rhyme, or assonance, and is not intended to be emphatic. So the *Vulgate* translates, omitting the pronoun: *Principes manu suspensi sunt*.—HENDERSON also omits the pronoun: but he overlooks the Niphal form of the verb and makes the enemy its subject. He translates, *Princes they hung up by the hand*. BOOTHROYD, more correctly, *Princes were hung up by the hand*. He supposes that the Princes and elders were first murdered and then hung up. OWEN: "The most obvious meaning of the words is, that Princes were hung or suspended by the hand, and not by the neck. Such a punishment . . . may have been a barbarity resorted to by the Chaldeans. This seems to be the meaning conveyed by the Versions and the Targum." If they were not tortured to death in this way, it is not unlikely that "the sons of Zedekiah," and "all the Princes of Judah" were slain in *Riblah* by being beheaded, and that their headless trunks were suspended by the hands on the walls of the city. Thus the headless, naked body of Saul, and the bodies of his three sons, were fastened to the walls of *Bethshan* (1 Sam. xxxi. 8-12). "It was a custom with the Persians, after they had slain, strangled, or beheaded their enemy, to hang their bodies upon poles or empale them. In this way they treated Hirstæus of Miletum, and Leonidas of Lacedæmon. See Herodotus, Lib. vi. c. 30; Lib. vii. c. 238" (ADAM CLARKE). Or, there may have been instances in which Princes were thus suspended, not after death, nor for the purpose of killing them, but as an ignominious and torturing punishment. It is said that "no punishment is more common in the East. Has a master a refractory slave, . . . several men are called, who tie the offender's hands and hoist him to the roof till he beg forgiveness" (Comp. Comm.).—W. H. H.] **The faces of Elders were not regarded.** This is said in allusion to Lev. xix. 32, "Thou shalt honor the face of the old man," comp. Lev. xix. 15; Ex. xxiii. 3. Although in the places referred to, the word *Elders* is intended as a designation of age, not of dignity, yet we are obliged to take it in the latter sense here; because it is placed in parallelism with *Princes*, and because *the aged* in contrast with the *youthful* are spoken of in ver. 14.

Ver. 13. **They took the young men to grind—the young men are obliged to carry the mill** —[NOYES: *Young men carried mill-stones*]. The *Vulgate* translates, *Adolescentibus impudice abusi sunt* (same as, *Adolescentes molitionem passi sunt*). [DOUAY: *They abused the young men indecently,*

which is explained by this note, "*i. e.*, made them grind naked in the mill." But the second clause of the verse is against any such interpretation of the first clause. The explanations, *Juvenes ad molendum sumserunt*, Young men were taken to grind, and *Juvenes molas agitarunt* or *versarunt*, Young men shook or turned mills, are verbally incorrect, for the verb אָטַר does not mean *agitare*, to shake: to give it the sense of *turning*, $\text{לָּ$ would be necessary. But the simple literal meaning of the word [to *lift*, GERLACH:—to *carry*], entirely suffices. For not only was the *carrying* of the hand-mills on the journey a heavy burden, but that they carried these implies that they were also compelled to *turn* them, *i. e.*, to

grind with them. As thus explained, the first clause corresponds with the second. **And** [The omission of the conjunction in this song, where it might be expected, makes its expression here more emphatic. *Young men* have been compelled to carry mill-stones, even boys, or mere children have fallen under the heavy burdens of wood they were forced to carry.—W. H. H.] **the children fell under the wood.**—*Boys fall* [properly, *fell*, or *have fallen*.—W. H. H.] *under the wood.* The בְּחַיִּים , the most blooming and strongest of the youth were obliged to carry the mill-stones (see HERZ. *R.-Enc.* x. p. 82), the boys generally were required to drag the wood. [The most laborious and menial services were required of the Jewish youth and children.—W. H. H.]

V. 14-18.

14 The elders have ceased from the gate, the young men from their music. The
15 joy of our heart is ceased; our dance is turned into mourning. The crown is
16 fallen from our head: woe unto us, that we have sinned! For this our heart is
17 faint; for these *things* our eyes are dim. Because of the mountain of Zion, which
18 is desolate, the foxes walk upon it.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 14. שָׁבַת with מִן following, Jer. vii. 34; xvi. 9; xxxi. 36; xxxvi. 29; xlviii. 33.— נְנִינָה־ . See iii. 14.

Ver. 15. מְשׁוֹשׁ Jeremiah uses only once, xlix. 25. The expression שָׁבַת מְשׁוֹשׁ is found in Is. xxiv. 8; comp. Hos. ii. 13.— נִהְפָּךְ see ver. 2.— לֵאכֹל —see Am. viii. 10. Jeremiah uses the word three times, vi. 26; xvi. 7; xxxi. 13.— מִכְּחֹלֶנֶה , see Ps. xxx. 12; Jer. xxxi. 4, 13.

Ver. 16. עָמְרָת רֹאשׁ , only elsewhere in Job xix. 9. Jeremiah uses עָמְרָת once, xiii. 18.— אִי־ Jeremiah uses frequently, iv. 13; vi. 4; x. 19; xiii. 26; xv. 10; xlviii. 46. Also אִי־נָא , iv. 31; xlv. 3. [OWEN insists on translating the particle נָא , *Woe is now to us*. But to one ignorant of the Hebrew, the *now* would inevitably be taken in its temporal sense, which the Hebrew particle never has. The E. V. is followed by all the English translators, except OWEN.—W. H. H.]— חֲטָאֵנָה , see Jer. liii. 25; viii. 14; xiv. 7, 20.

Ver. 17. רֹהֵר , see i. 13, 22.— עֲנִינֵי־חֲשָׁכִי occurs elsewhere only in Ps. lxxix. 24.—see iv. 8.

Ver. 18. שִׁשְׁשָׁם , see Jer. xii. 11; Dan. ix. 17.— שֶׁלֶט , *relat.*, ii. 15.— שִׁנְעָלִים , Jeremiah never uses the word. He expresses the same idea otherwise, ix. 10; x. 22; xlix. 33; li. 37.—Jeremiah never uses the Piel הִלֵּךְ , see Ps. lxxxix. 16.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[Vers. 14-18 depict the depressing effects of these various wrongs and humiliations on the feelings and deportment of the people.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 14. **The elders have ceased from the gate, the young men from their music.** [The German language enables GERLACH to give a verbally literal translation: *Die Aeltesten feiern vom Thor, die Jünglinge von ihrem Saitenspiel*. We have no words in English that so accurately translate שָׁבַת and נְנִינָה . NOXES' translation, which is also LUTHER'S—*The elders sit no more at the gate; the young men have ceased from their music*—restricts the meaning of the first clause, mistranslates the verb, and renders it necessary to supply a verb in the second clause. The idea is not merely that the elders no longer occupy their seats in the gates,—but that they *rest* or *cease* from all those duties and pleasures that pertain to their age and dignity. While elders here designate *old men*, in antithesis to

young men, it is not to the exclusion of the official elders, who are regarded as types and representatives of those past middle-life,—of those who especially delighted in resorting to the gates of the city, whether their official duties called them there or not. HENDERSON: "It is common in the East for aged men to meet in the open space without the gate of the city, to pass the time in narrating or hearing the news of the day, or the stories of bygone years. From this an easy transition is made to the jocund pastime of the young."—W. H. H.] The gate was, as it were, the court of the elders of the people, and, at the same time, the principal place of social entertainment. See WINER, *R. W. B. s. v. Thore*. For this reason, and also on account of the second clause of the verse, we must consider, not only the discontinuance of public business, but the loss of that pleasure which the gate afforded to the older men. **The young men from their music.** THENIUS remarks correctly that Jeremiah "in the threatenings, vii. 34 and xvi. 9, expresses himself concerning the loss of

happiness in a way similar to this, and yet differing from what is said here." [To suppose this verse to refer especially to the city of Jerusalem (CALVIN) is in itself absurd. There were no longer gates, elders, or young men in Jerusalem, of whom these things could be said. Throughout this song, the Prophet generalizes and does not particularize with reference to times and places.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 15. Whilst, as has been said, vers. 11-14 enter into details, vers. 15, 16, generalize the facts. [Ver. 14 is more closely connected with what follows than with what precedes it. It describes the disheartening effects, on the minds and conduct of the people, of what had happened. It does not state, as all the preceding verses do, some special cause of humiliation or suffering.—W. H. H.] **The joy of our heart is ceased; our dance is turned into mourning.**—[Ceased has the joy of our heart, changed to mourning our dance. **Is ceased.** GATAKER: "Heb. hath rested: the same term that was before, ver. 14, and it may seem to have some glance at such mirth and cheer, as they were wont to have at their solemn festivals and on their Sabbaths, Deut. xvi. 11, 14; xxviii. 47, 48; 2 Chron. xxix. 36; Ps. xlii. 4; lxxxi. 1, 2; xcii. 1, 2."—W. H. H.]

Ver. 16. **The crown is fallen from our head** [marg. *The crown of our head*. So BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, HENDERSON, OWEN. It is more literal, but bad English. The crown of the head, in English, is something very different from the crown on the head. The one cannot fall without the head it belongs to. The other may fall from the head; so here: *Fallen has the crown from our head*.—W. H. H.] **Woe unto us, that—for—we have sinned.** I must regard the second half of this verse as a conclusion [*i. e.* of a paragraph, or one of the principal parts of the chapter], corresponding to that of ver. 7. I do not, therefore, believe that ver. 16 is to be connected with ver. 17, and that by the *crown on our head* is to be understood "Jerusalem, as a diadem set upon Zion with its splendid palaces" (THENIUS), although the expression by itself could have such an interpretation. Rather, I believe that the first clause of ver. 16 is in very close connection with ver. 15; and that the first clause of ver. 16 declares, that not only all joy, but also all honor has forsaken Jerusalem. The crown on the head of Jerusalem had consisted in this, that she was *great among the nations, a princess among the provinces, and perfect in beauty, the joy of the whole earth* (i. 1; ii. 15). [It confuses the sense to suppose that Jerusalem is the subject from whose head the crown has fallen. The people generally are the subject; "the crown of our head has fallen." In the loss of independent nationality, and of all honor among the nations, who now treated them with the utmost contempt, the crown had indeed fallen from their heads. However intimately related are vers. 7 and 16, however striking and fine it would be, rhetorically considered, if each stood in the position of an emphatic conclusion to corresponding strophes (if this is poetry), or paragraphs (if it is prose); yet, in point of fact, each of these verses is too intimately connected with the verses immediately following it, to be separated from them without injuring the logical connection of the thoughts.

—W. H. H.]—**We have sinned!** A gratifying advance is observable here, in so far as the people now openly and honorably confess their own guilt. See iii. 39-42.

Vers. 17, 18. These two verses constitute the introduction to the closing prayer, vers. 19-22. They refer to a fact which must be the cause of deepest pain to a heart truly attached to the theocracy,—the desolation of the holy mountain. But this gloomy and dark image constitutes only the back-ground for those noble and consolatory thoughts with which the Bard (Sänger) comforts himself in his prayer.

Ver. 17. **For this our heart is faint; for these things our eyes are dim.** *On this account is our heart faint, therefore are our eyes become dim.* For the reasons given above we refer the pronominal phrases עַל-זֶה, *on this account* (darob) [E.V.,

for this], and עַל-אֵלֶּה, *therefore* (darüber) [E.V.,

for these things], to what follows in reference to Mount Zion in ver. 18. [The objections to this interpretation are insuperable. 1. In point of fact, the desolation of Zion was not the only, nor the absorbing cause of grief, as is evident from the whole of the preceding part of this Song, in which abundant and terrible causes of distress are given, without a single allusion to the desolation of Zion. 2. The second pronominal suffix

עַל-אֵלֶּה (correctly translated in English Version, *for these things*) is plural, and must include

more than the first suffix עַל-זֶה (*for this thing*), which is singular. It is obvious that both cannot refer to the single statement in ver. 18, that Mount Zion has become desolate. Nor can it be said, that two things are stated in ver. 18, namely, that Mount Zion is desolate; and that the foxes run upon it. For the latter statement is a mere expansion or illustration of the first: and it would be very absurd to make the latter a special and additional cause of grief, regarded as in any sense distinct from the first great fact that the mountain is desolate. 3. This interpretation involves a redundancy of relative expository phrases, all referring to the same thing, that is useless, inelegant, and utterly incongruous with the prevailing style of composition in the Lamentations, which is terse, compressed and remarkable for the absence of words not actually indispensable, as, for example, of the connecting ! (which the Masorites were so anxious to insert), and of the repeated verb, causing a constant recurrence of the Zeugma, see vers. 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 19. Is it likely that such a writer would say,

on account of this thing (עַל-זֶה), *on account of these things* (עַל-אֵלֶּה), *on account of* (עַל) Mount Zion,

etc., our heart is faint, our eyes are dim; using three relative expository phrases, where one would have sufficed? 4. By referring the verse to what precedes it, these relative phrases, instead of being redundant and cumbersome, become significant and impressive. *For this* (namely, that the crown has fallen from our head because we have sinned), *our heart is faint; for these things* (namely, all the evils that have been recited), *our eyes are dim.* We may then take ver. 18 as an ad-

ditional reason for lamentation, translating על, *on account of*, or take it as an independent, but not unrelated, thought, translating על, *as to*: see remarks on that verse.—W. H. H.]—**Our eyes are dim** [*our eyes have become dim*]. We must regard weeping, according to ii. 11, as the immediate cause of the eyes becoming dim. [Weeping suggests itself as a sufficient physical cause, and if the Prophet means this, then *our eyes have become dim*, is a poetical way of intimating how greatly they have wept. But there is no allusion to tears in the context; the period of violent weeping, indeed, we may regard as past: and the parallelism is better carried out by regarding the dimness of the eyes as the effect of the faintness of the heart. So NOYES: “*our eyes are dim*; i. e., through faintness the sight of our eyes departs. On the other hand, the eyes are said to be enlightened when the strength is restored and faintness departs. See 1 Sam. xiv. 29.” We are not to restrict the thought to merely physical causes and effects. The faintness of the heart suggests a moral cause, the effect of which would be that moral dimness of sight which ensues, when God is no longer seen and hope expires. It is this underlying thought that connects ver. 17 with ver. 18.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 18. **Because of the mountain of Zion, which is [has become] desolate, the foxes walk upon it.** The Mount of Zion is here evidently intended, not in the restricted sense, but in the wider sense in which it “includes Moriah.” See DELITZSCH on Ps. ii. 6; ix. 12; lxxvi. 3, etc. [The name Zion is used throughout the Lamentations, with great uniformity and precision, of Jerusalem as the theocratic city, where God has His dwelling-place, and always with special reference to the most sacred precincts of that city, where were the Temple of God and the palace of the king. Here the word *Mount* makes the designation more plain. The whole city, doubtless, is intended; but it is the city regarded as the dwelling-place of God, the throne of the Theocracy. Probably the word is always used by the Prophets in this sense; and a regard to this fact will spare us the difficulties of determining whether Mount Moriah, the Temple mount, was included generically in Mount Zion, or is always to be distinguished from Mount Zion.—W. H. H.]—**The foxes walk [have walked] upon it.** Where these beasts live the habitations of men must have ceased to exist. See Ps. lxxiii. 11; comp. Judg. xv. 4; Ez. xlii. 4. It may also be properly assumed, that if Jerusalem had been destroyed within a few weeks, those ravenous beasts were busily engaged roaming through its holy precincts seeking for the carcasses of the dead. [**Foxes.** שְׁעִלִים. *Jackals*, BOOTHROYD, WORDSWORTH, GERLACH. See KITTO’s *Cyc. Bib. Lit.* If preying on dead men was mentioned, or even distinctly hinted at, we might be sure that the jackal, or wolf, or some other ravenous member of the canine species, is probably intended; for foxes are not addicted to this. A better reason for supposing that *jackals* are meant, is the plural form of the word (though this could be explained by the preference of the writer for terminations in ם), as if they went

about on the Holy Mount in companies; for the jackal is a gregarious, the fox a solitary animal.

But the Hebrew הֶלְכֵנִי, may mean, not walking about on the mountain, but *walking* in the frequentative sense, or *living* (see הֶלְכֵנִי, Piel in Eccl. iv. 15) in the mountain. In this case the reference would be to these animals, whether foxes or jackals, having their burrows there, remaining there permanently and undisturbed. This gives a better idea of the utter desolation that reigned on Mount Zion, and is more consonant with the fact, that more than “a few weeks” must have elapsed since the city was completely destroyed and consumed to its foundations, and, therefore, there were no corpses there to invite the predatory excursions of the jackals.—But what is the connection of ver. 18 with ver. 17? How is the

preposition על to be translated? BROUGHTON very elegantly preserves the obscurity of the original; “*For this our heart is sick, for these things our eyes be dim. For Mount Zion which is desolate, the foxes walk upon it.*” We can translate על, as in the preceding verse, *on account of*, and then this verse is immediately connected with the preceding verse, and assigns an additional reason, why the heart is sick, and the eyes dim, namely, that Mount Zion is desolate. That is the same as saying, that God has withdrawn from His people: their heart is faint and their eyes dim on account of past and present troubles, and also because there is no prospect of relief for them, for God’s house is destroyed, and Jehovah has forsaken His people. This is excellent sense, and were there no question as to the grammatical construction we might be satisfied with it. But we may translate על, *as to* (GERLACH, über), *as to Mount Zion which has become desolate, the foxes have walked upon it.* Thus rendered, this verse is independent of the preceding verse as to grammatical construction, but intimately related to it in sense. This is recom-

mended by several considerations. 1. על, by itself, rarely has the sense of *on account of*. 2. The ו, *relativum*, properly throws the idea connected with it into a parenthesis. If so, then the idea that *Zion lies waste*, is not the prominent idea, but is subordinate to what, in itself is an insignificant fact, that *the foxes walk upon it*. Surely that could not constitute the climax of their grief, who had to lament for dishonored women, princes, and elders, and the cruellest oppression of tender children! 3. If the foxes walking on Zion is a fact significant of something else of far deeper import (as in truth it is, though this method of construction does not suggest that interpretation), yet in such a case it is to be observed, that the על should be repeated before the last clause. *Our heart is faint, our eyes dim, Because of Mount Zion, because the foxes walk upon it.* In every case the construction is awkward.

4. By taking על in the sense of *as to*, we have perfect grammatical construction: *As to Mount Zion, which has become desolate, the foxes walk upon*

it! 5. This at once suggests the real force of the expression, *the foxes walk upon it*, and gives dignity to what else would be an insignificant culmination point of the sublime grief expressed in what precedes. *As to Mount Zion*, from whence ought to come our help and salvation, the foxes have it now for their home! It is no longer the dwelling-place of God, and the refuge of His people. This is no sentimental effusion of grief, that the foxes roam where the proud and happy city once stood. It is the expression of a terrible

truth, that Jehovah had forsaken His people; and what had been His dwelling-place, now laid waste and destroyed, is the home of wild beasts. 6. This explanation is favored by the emphatic declaration that follows in ver. 19, and especially by the emphatic expression of the personal pronoun: *Thou, Jehovah art forever*. Thy dwelling-place is the home of the wild beasts, but Thou Thyself dost still exist, dost still reign, and Thy people pray Thee to return to them, and have mercy upon them.—W. H. H.]

V. 19-22.

19 Thou, O LORD, remainest forever; thy throne from generation to generation. 20, 21 Wherefore dost thou forget us forever, and forsake us so long time? Turn thou 22 us unto thee, O LORD, and we shall be turned; renew our days as of old. But thou hast utterly rejected us; thou art very wrath against us.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Ver. 19.—[BLAYNEY: "The LXX., Syr., Vulg. and Arabic all express the conjunction at the beginning of this verse. Two MSS. read *וְאֵת*, and so it is found in the notes of the celebrated printed Bible, No. 300"]—*בְּכֶמֶס*, frequently in Jeremiah, i. 15; iii. 17, etc.—*לְדֹר וְדֹר* Jeremiah never uses. He says only once *וְדֹר וְדֹר*, i. 39. [The writer who only once used a common expression with a common preposition, is the very one who would be likely only once to use the same expression with another preposition.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 20.—*לְנֶצַח*, Jer. iii. 5; i. 39.—*שָׁכַח*, Jer. ii. 32; iii. 21, etc.—*עֹנֶב*, Jer. ii. 13; xii. 7, etc.—*אֶתְּךָ* Jeremiah never uses. See Ps. xciii. 6; xciii. 5.

Ver. 21.—The verb *חָשַׁח* (except here, used only in Piel and Hiph.) is not found in Jeremiah.—*בְּכֶמֶס*, see Jer. xxx. 30.

Ver. 22.—*כִּי־אָמַר*, Jer. xiv. 19, ii. 37; vi. 30, etc.—*קִצְרָךְ*, Jer. xxxvii. 5.—*כִּי־אָרַךְ* Jeremiah uses twice, xviii. 13; xlviii. 16; *עַד־כִּי־אָרַךְ* never. [Poor little *עַד*, slighted by Jeremiah *twice*! takes its revenge by having the last word to say against his authorship of the Lamentations.—W. H. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 19-22. This short prayer contains four thoughts. 1. A positive source of consolation; the throne of the Lord stands immovably fast, ver. 19. 2. A question: Why then should the Lord forget His people forever? ver. 20. 3. A petition: that the Lord would re-establish His people spiritually and temporally, ver. 21. 4. A negative source of consolation: the Lord cannot be angry forever, ver. 22.

Ver. 19. **THOU, O LORD**,—*Thou, Jehovah*. [BLAYNEY, BOOTHROYD, NOYES: *But Thou, Jehovah*. See Textual notes above. Whether the *וְ* originally belonged to the text or not, the emphatic expression of the personal pronoun *אַתָּה*, and the parallelism between vers. 18 and 19, involve the sense of *but*, *yet*, or *as to*, before the pronoun. *As to Zion, it is desolate,—but Thou endurest forever, or as to Thee, though Thy dwelling-place is gone, Thou endurest*. GATAKER indicates this in this brief note, "*But, or Yet, to be supplied*."—W. H. H.].—**Remainest forever**,—[lit., *sittest forever*. But when this is said of God or of human monarchs, it always refers to their occupying the throne; see Ps. lxi. 8 (7); ix. 5 (4), 12 (11); Zech. vi. 13. The king *sits*, the subject stands. The instant mention of the throne, shows that this must be the meaning here. Not God's continual existence,

but His uninterrupted sovereignty over His creatures. HENDERSON and NOYES translate, *sittest as king*. But this seems to lower the thought to a comparison with human monarchs. Though God is called and is a King, yet it is not as any ordinary king that He occupies the throne. GERLACH translates, *Thou art enthroned forever*. This produces a slight tautology. *Thou reignest forever* (GATAKER), may, perhaps, be as accurate a translation of the word, as our English affords.—W. H. H.].—**Thy throne from generation to generation**. See Ps. xlv. 7; lxxxix. 5; xciii. 2. In opposition to the desolation of the external sanctuary, the Poet holds up before himself the consolation, that the Lord Himself nevertheless sits firmly on His throne and His kingdom remains immovable. The heathen could destroy the Temple; to the Lord Himself they could do no harm. See Ps. ix. 8 (7); xxix. 16, cxlvi. 10; cxxv. 1.

Ver. 20. **Wherefore dost thou forget us forever, and forsake us so long time?** (margin. *for length of days*). *Why shouldst Thou forever forget us, and forsake us for long time?* It ought to be distinctly observed, that it is not said *שָׁכַחְתָּנוּ*, *Thou hast forgotten*, *עֹזְבָתָנוּ*, *Thou hast forsaken*. The Poet does not ask, *Why hast Thou forgotten and forsaken us forever?* But why wouldst or shouldst Thou forsake us forever? That He would do this, the Poet cannot believe. See Ps. lxxiv. 2 (1); lxxvii. 8-10 (7-9). [As

OWEN has suggested, we are undoubtedly to regard this as a prayer for present and immediate relief. The Prophet well understood that the captivity would not end before seventy years. That for that time at least Zion must remain desolate. He also firmly believed that after that time, the people would return to their own land, and God would dwell on Mount Zion. He could not therefore ask, with any reference to the possibility of such a thing, if God intended to forsake the Jewish people forever? But what He does ask is, if He would forever or *always* (נצח, constantly, continuously) forget and forsake *for length of days*, for a long period of time, or for all their life-time, that suffering generation of His people? Would He leave them in their present misery without any relief, any show of mercy? Though Zion was desolate, and God had withdrawn His theocratic presence from the people, and the Prophet knew that He would not in that sense return to the people again, till that sinful generation was dead, yet, he says, Thou still art God, Thou reignest forever, Thy throne remains unmoved by any mundane events,—why then shouldst Thou continuously, persistently forget us and completely abandon us to our present sorrow? The pronoun *us* here, embraces the persons of those embraced by the *us* in the preceding verses of the Song. Had he intended the people as such, and not the people individually considered, he would probably have used some such designation as *the daughter of Thy people*, or simply *Thy people*. The prayer as thus interpreted was answered. Long before the captivity ended, God had mercy on the sufferers, gave them favor in the eyes of men, and relieved them from many of their distresses. The verse then ought to be translated, *Wherefore shouldst Thou always forget us, shouldst Thou abandon us*—i. e. to our present misery—for *length of days*, that is, for any long but indefinite period of time?—W. H. H.]

Ver. 21. **Turn Thou us unto Thee, O LORD—Jehovah—and we shall be turned.** The Poet well knows that a restoration is possible; but he also knows its conditions. He has before his eyes what is said in Jer. xxxi. 16-22; iii. 1-4, 12, in which the idea שוב [to turn] is employed in a variety of ways.—The words הִשְׁבִּינוּ ה' [turn us and we shall turn] are a direct quotation from Jer. xxxi. 18. See remarks on that passage. Comp. Ps. lxxx. 4 (3), 8 (7), 20 (19). The question is whether the Poet prayed only for temporal, or only for spiritual restoration? It is in point of fact not imaginable, that there could be one without the other. But he knows that in order to either kind of restoration, the Lord must take the initiative. And especially, first of all, He must lead back the people to Himself. Only when the Lord has accomplished this—but then most certainly—will the people return back to the Lord and to the place of His gracious presence and so be restored to the old covenant relationship. [There are three ways of understanding this prayer, which Dr. NAGELSBACH has not distinguished with his usual admirable perspicuity. 1. It can be understood as a prayer for the restoration of the old condition of things, involv-

ing a return to their own land. OWEN: “‘The meaning of this sentence is,’ says GROTIUS, ‘Restore us to Thy favor, that we may be restored to our ancient state.’ Were this evidently the meaning, the rendering ought to be thus,—*Restore us, O Jehovah, to Thyself, that we may be restored.*” It is obvious that the words so translated do not express what is claimed for them. *Restore us to Thyself, that we may be restored*, can only mean that *we may be restored to Thyself*. This might involve as a consequence the return of the “ancient state.” But if that had been the main idea, it would have been differently expressed. Besides people are apt to pray for what they most need and are likely to get. The pressing need of the people now, was instant relief from suffering. This they might have without a return to their land. The latter they could not expect for themselves, and were sure that it would come eventually to a future generation. 2. In a strictly theocratic sense. That God would bring them back to Himself and they be restored to His favor and blessed with all the blessings of the covenant. This would not involve necessarily an immediate return to their own land; and gives a good sense. Yet it does not seem fully to express the natural meaning of the words. Nor is it grammatically correct to take שָׁב in a passive, instead of an active sense.

3. It can be regarded as a prayer for converting grace. *Turn Thou us to Thyself and we shall turn*, i. e. to Thee. This is the simplest and most natural translation. It is consistent with the fact, that the people throughout this Song, while speaking collectively, are yet regarded as individuals. It harmonizes with the evident meaning of ver. 20. It is such a prayer as was eminently proper in their circumstances. It is consistent with the whole doctrine of the Bible in regard to converting grace, or the grace of repentance. Finally, it prepares the way for the final petition, *renew our days as of old*.—W. H. H.].—**Renew our days as of old.** The construction is a prolepsis. *Renew our days*, i. e. *vitam, vitæ conditionem*, Job x. 5, so that they may be as they were formerly. [This petition is general and comprehensive. It reaches forward to the time when all they had possessed and enjoyed would be theirs again as a people,—Country, Temple, Priest, Prophet, and King. But it does not require the instant or even speedy fulfilment of these things; nor does this petition afford any ground for the argument (OWEN) that the preceding petition must be of the same purport.—W. H. H.]

Ver. 22. **But Thou hast utterly rejected us; (marg. For wilt Thou utterly reject us?) Thou art very wroth against us. Or hast Thou wholly rejected us, and art exceedingly angry with us?** The verse contains, as remarked above, a negative fundamental statement. The meaning of the conjunction אֲבָרָא [but, except, unless] is, *it may be then that*. See Gen. xxviii. 17; Is. xlii. 19; Prov. iii. 12; my Gr. § 110, 4, note, EWALD, § 356. The idea of realization is to be supplied before the conjunction, from the foregoing prayer; this will be done, *unless Thou mayest have utterly abandoned us*. [CALVIN: *Except Thou hast wholly rejected us, and hast become very angry*

with us. BOOTHROYD puts the first clause interrogatively, *For wilt Thou altogether cast us off? Thou hast been wroth against us exceedingly.* But both verbs are preterites, and neither can be taken in a future sense. For the same reason, the verbs cannot be translated as NOYES renders them, taking both clauses interrogatively, *For shouldst Thou utterly reject us? Shouldst Thou be so exceedingly wroth against us?* We must either accept the sense of Dr. NABEGBACH'S translation, with which CALVIN and GERLACH agree, or accept the text of the English Version, with which agree Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg., Targ., BROUGHTON, BLAYNEY, HENDERSON, and OWEN, an imposing weight of authority. If we adopt the latter sense, then we must accept of OWEN'S as the only possible explanation, that the reference is to themselves as individuals, not as representatives of the Jewish race. They knew that God had not utterly rejected the nation. They knew that as a nation, they would be restored to their land. In either case, the opinion that this prayer is a prayer for immediate relief as individuals, and not for final restoration as a nation, is evident. For, if we adopt the sense of the text of the English version, we cannot believe that Jeremiah meant to announce the utter rejection of the nation; and if we prefer the sense of the margin of the English version, we cannot believe that Jeremiah would close this magnificent poem with a question involving the possibility of God's utter rejection of the whole nation. Rather, we must regard these closing words as one last plaintive cry for mercy,—*unless Thou hast utterly rejected us, who are now in misery, and hast become exceedingly angry with us*, so that Thy wrath cannot be appeased, and the mercy, we implore in vain for ourselves, is to be reserved for another and more pious generation of Israelites.—W. H. H.]

The Hebrew codices repeat, for the purpose of synagogue reading, after ver. 22, the words of ver. 21, as they do also [repeat the verse before the last, after the last verse] at the close of Isaiah, Malachi, and Ecclesiastes, "in order to close with consolatory words." See DELITZSCH, Is. p. 651. [HUGH BROUGHTON: *Turn us, O Eternal, unto Thee, and we shall return; renew our days as of old.* The ver. 21 is one of the four which, in the Massoreth Bible, are printed as a postscript for better memory. Another is the last save one in Ecclesiastes, another the last save one in Esay, the fourth the last save one in Malachi, as I noted upon Ecclesiastes. These sayings contain the main of the writers. That in Ecclesiastes biddeth us look for all happiness in the world to come, that of Esay telleth how all Moyses' policy shall end. That of Malachi showeth how John Baptist shall begin the New Testament. And this of Jeremy telleth that God will begin a new state for his people. Upon that they studied in Babylon fifty years, and they made themselves a golden age, knowing that the kingdom of Christ was in suffering. Afterwards they are plainly told of the true kingdom, and be renewed, as of old. This verse was given in the beginning of the captivity for a comfort that way." WORDSWORTH: "*Turn Thou us unto Thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned.* A very appropriate prayer for Israel weeping over the ruins

of Jerusalem,—destroyed first by the Chaldean armies, and next, on the anniversary of the same day, by the power of Rome, for its sins. Israel says, 'Turn Thou us, O Lord, and we shall be turned;' and the Apostle of Israel, the great Hebrew of the Hebrews, St. Paul, says, 'Even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn unto the Lord, the veil shall be taken away' (2 Cor. iii. 15, 16). May He hasten the time! Then the dirge of Lamentation will be changed into a jubilee of joy."]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Ver. 1. **Remember, O LORD.** "It is unworthy of the majesty of God to impute the fault of forgetfulness to Him, but He may be entreated to be mindful or to remember, in order to render speedy assistance to the needy, and thus make manifest what [*viz.* His remembrance] was before concealed." RHABANUS in GHISLER., p. 213.

2. Ver. 1. [**Consider, and behold.** CALVIN: "The words, though brief and concise, yet contain a useful doctrine, that God is pleased to bring help to the miserable when their evils come to an account before Him, especially when they are unjustly oppressed. It is indeed certain, that nothing is unknown to God, but this mode of speaking is according to the perceptions of men; for we think that God disregards our miseries, or we imagine that His back is turned to us when He does not immediately succor us. But He is simply to be asked to look on our evils, . . . as soon as He is pleased to look on the evils we suffer, aid is at the same time prepared for us."—**Our reproach.** CALVIN: "There is mention especially made of *reproach*, that the indignity might move God the more; for it was for this end that He took the people under His protection, that they might be for His glory and honor, as Moses says. As then, it was God's will that the riches of His glory should appear in that people, nothing could have been more inconsistent than that, instead of glory, they should have nothing but disgrace and reproach. This, then, is the reason why the Prophet makes a special mention of the *reproach* of the people."]

3. Ver. 1. "He does not say, 'Remember, O Lord, our enemies, that they may suffer as their deeds deserve,' but, 'Be mindful of what has happened to us,' as if he would say in effect, 'Remembering the evils which we suffer take them away, but overlook the doers of them.' When he says, 'What has happened,' or 'what has been done to us,' he discriminates between what we suffer and what is natural [normal], for these evils are not natural or normal, but accidental, resulting from the manifold effects of sin." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 213.

4. Ver. 1. "The cross seems all the lighter when we lament over it to a true, confidential friend, and show him how it pains us, and he with brotherly sympathy or good advice, removes from us a part of our burden. But men cannot always help us, however sincerely they desire to do so. But he who commends his affairs to God, complains to the right and faithful Helper, who has invited us to pray to Him (Ps. xlii. 6; xxvii. 8; xxxvii. 5; lv. 23; Sir. ii. 11)." EGR. MÜN-

nus. "In adversity we should not, with the Papists, fly for assistance to the dead, who are ignorant of our afflictions (Is. lxiii. 16;) nor, with the superstitious and profane, to magicians and wizards (Is. viii. 19, 20); but, after the example of the church in this passage, we should fly to the Lord (Hos. vi. 1-3 [E. V. Hos. v. 15-vi. 2]; 2 Chr. xx. 12)." FÖRSTER.

5. Vers. 2-16. "Because everything contained in this list of evils was long before predicted to the Israelites with the greatest exactness [lit. *to a very hair's breadth*] in the ancient Mosaic list [of curses], contained in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, . . . we learn from the agreement of the Mosaic list with the manifest *eventu* or fulfilment in the captive people of Judah, how the threatenings, contained for us in God's word are to be regarded, not as mere empty, inefficient words to terrify us, but for an undoubted, sure, and certain reckoning and list, whereby God's temporal and eternal wrath from Heaven against the ungodly is revealed and threatened, as it is written in the first chapter of Romans." EGID. HUNNIUS. "This is useful, that we may carry the cup straight, and look well to ourselves, lest it may happen to us in the same way that faith comes to be experience." CRAMER.

6. Ver. 2. "That these things may not happen to us also, let us be pious, upright, and temperate in the acquisition, possession, and use of our property; in reference to which Paul admonishes us in 1 Cor. vii. 30, 31, that while we are in the world, we should not use the world [Vulg.], that we may have worldly possessions, but should possess them as though we had them not. Besides that threefold woe of Habakkuk (ii. 6) presses hard upon us. Use is commendable, abuse criminal." FÖRSTER.

7. Ver. 3. **Our mothers are as widows.** "By mothers are intended the seven synagogues, which are known to have been established principally on the Mount Olives, from which flowed the milk of doctrine. . . . But in the time of the siege or of the Chaldean ravages, their children having been removed, they were abandoned and consumed with fire." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 214.

8. Vers. 4, 6, 9, 10. "We learn especially how God punishes the misuse of His gifts of plenty and abundance; when, for instance, men are not thankful to God in times of profusion and cheapness, but squander uselessly His gifts, wine and fruits of the earth, by gormandizing and carousing, gluttonizing and guzzling, banqueting and tipping; then God withdraws His blessings and gifts; food becomes scarce so that it is not easily procured; and He sends a famine so that water and precious bread can hardly be obtained, as was the case with the Jewish people. But they had well deserved it by their rioting, which the Prophet Isaiah long before rebuked, when he enumerated, among other gross vices of the house of Judah, drunkenness also, and called down a woe upon it (Is. v. 11-13, comp. Amos vi. 4-7) . . . But the punishment terminates not in temporal poverty. Excessive indulgence in eating and drinking is such a pernicious vice that a man forfeits thereby his part in the Kingdom of Heaven (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10), and must be deprived of eternal happiness, and must suffer thirst with

the rich drunkard eternally in the flames of Hell (Luke xvi.; Is. v. 14)." EGID. HUNNIUS.

9. Ver. 6. "According to the real meaning of the Hebrew, the church weeps for her children, when members of Christ and ministers of the altar, for the sake of earthly things, give the hand to those more powerful or to worldly men, who are rendered foul by the blackness of their [ill-gotten] wealth or other crimes." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 216.

10. Ver. 7. "Undeservedly, O Roman, must thou pay the penalty for the sins of thine ancestors." HORACE, Odes, B. III., Ode 6. "Already have we sufficiently expiated the perjury of the Laomedonian Troy with our blood." VIRGIL, *Georg.* 1., 501, 2. "This is rightly lamented in the church also, that when the priests and the princes of the earth are delinquent, for their faults, as it were, the people are punished." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 218. "When their kings act the fool, the Greeks are punished." HORACE.

11. Ver. 7. [POOL's *Annot.*: "We must not understand this in the same sense as Ez. xviii. 2, where God reflecteth upon them for using a proverb to this sense. It is the Prophet who here speaketh, and in the name of the godly Jews, who would not excuse themselves as if they suffered merely for their forefathers' sins. But the Prophet confesseth and bewaileth that God had punished their iniquities and the iniquities of their forefathers together; and it was better with their forefathers who had sinned, and were dead and gone, than with them, upon whom the punishment of their iniquity did abide, and was like so to do for a long time."—**Our fathers have sinned, and are not.** CALVIN: "Our Prophet's object was to turn God to mercy; and to attain this object he says, 'O Lord, Thou indeed hast hitherto executed just punishment, because our fathers had very long abused Thy goodness and forbearance; but now the time has come for Thee to try and prove whether we are like our fathers; as then, they have perished as they deserved, receive us now into favor.' We hence see that thus no quarrel or contention is carried on with God, but only that the miserable exiles ask God to look on them, since their fathers, who had provoked God and had experienced His dreadful vengeance, were already dead."—**And we have borne their iniquities.** CALVIN: "When he says that the sons *bore the iniquities* of the fathers, though it be a strong expression, yet its meaning is not as though God, without reason, punished their children and not their fathers; for unalterable is that declaration, 'The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor the father the iniquity of the son; but the soul that sinneth it shall die' (Ez. xviii. 20). It may yet be said that the children are loaded with the sins of their fathers, because God, as He declares by Moses, extends His vengeance to the third and fourth generation (Ex. xx. 5). And He says also in another place, 'I will return into the bosom of children the iniquity of their fathers' (Jer. xxxii. 18). God then continued His vengeance to their posterity. But yet there is no doubt but that the children who had been so severely punished, bore also the punishment of their own iniquity, for they deserved a hundred deaths. But these two things well agree together,

that God returns the iniquity of the fathers into the bosom of their children, and yet that the children are chastised for their own sins."

HENRY: "They acknowledge the reproach of sin which they bear. This comes in, in the midst of their complaints, but may well be put in the front of them. This is not here a peevish complaint, or an imputation of unrighteousness to God, like what we have in Jer. xxxi. 29; Ez. xviii. 2, but a penitent confession of the sins of their ancestors, which they themselves had also persisted in, for which they now justly suffered. Thus they submit themselves to the Divine justice, and refer themselves to the Divine pity. And, truly, the sins God looks back upon in punishing, we must look back upon in repenting, and must notice all that will help to justify God in correcting us. And if we be penitent and patient under what we suffer for the sins of our fathers, we may expect that He who punishes will pity, and soon return in mercy."]

11. Ver. 8. "Here occurs a lesson concerning slavery, in reference to which we must hold, that it may be regarded as belonging to the law of nations, but cannot be considered as belonging to the law of nature, because man was created and born for a state of liberty, but slavery is the punishment of sin, as is evident from Gen. ix. 25, where slavery was legally imposed upon Ham, who is, as it were, the patriarch of slaves." FÖRSTER.—[**Servants have ruled over us.** CLARKE: "To be subject to such is the most painful and dishonorable bondage:—

Quid domini faciant, audient cum talia fuer?
Virg. Ecl. iii. 16.

"Since slaves so insolent are grown,
What may not masters do?""]

12. Vers. 11-14. "We see by means of a passage relating to the Jews of that same period, when women begin to be haughty and virgins proud, that they are brought to dishonor and shame (Is. iii. 16-24). We see and learn also, when princes and chief men and the nobles in a land and nation boast of their position and worth, what perchance sometimes happens to them on that account. . . . Likewise when the old men or elders in the gates, or in their courts, let every sort of unrighteousness go free and for the sake of reward and gifts pervert the right, and yet will not allow their jurisdiction to be amended, as the elders in Judah would not be rebuked by the Prophets, then we see and learn, what follows thereon, that God lets the court and court-houses at last be reformed by the warriors with the broad axe, that court and judges may be converted, and court-houses lie in dust and ashes.

. . . Further, if the young men make too much of their sports, and young women of their songs and dances, we see and learn that God can cast the instruments of music out of their hands, and change their songs and dances into woful lamentations, as happened to the wilful youth among the Jewish people: to those who, before the Babylonish captivity, treated that matter too lightly, misused their music in their feasts and entertainments, so that the Prophets, Isaiah in his fifteenth chapter, Amos in his sixteenth, as also Jeremiah and others, were compelled to preach against it with all their might. But because their preaching was not heeded, God sent the Babylonians,

who stopped their proceedings, so that their pipes fell into the ashes, and their stringed instruments into the dirt, and they at Babylon had to hang up their harps on the willow-trees that were there, as is said in Ps. cxxxvii., and to carry instead of them mill-stones and wood, till they stumbled and fell under their burdens." EGD. HUNNIUS.

13. Ver. 13. "**The children fell under the wood.** The reason for this, according to our explanation was, because they were unwilling to believe on the Christ hanging on the wood. Hence one of the Apostles says, The cross is foolishness to the Gentiles, and to the Jews a stumbling-block. So then, they fell down under the wood, because they were unwilling to acknowledge that life which hangs upon the wood in order to destroy death." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 218.

14. Ver. 14. **MUSIC.** "Music is an unsuitable mode of expression for grief." Another saying of RHABANUS in GHISLER., p. 221. [And one wholly unworthy of repetition; especially impertinent as a comment on a lyrical dirge that sang its sorrows with the accompaniment of musical instruments. The young men gave up their merry, jovial songs, to stand weeping around their aged Prophet, as he poured out the lamentations of the church, in measured cadences, that added the melting pathos of music to his words and helped to relieve their swelling hearts of some of their tumultuous grief.—W. H. H.]

15. Ver. 16. **The crown is fallen from our head.** "When the church loses the grace of faith, her crowning honor falls from her head, because she exchanges the Lord of glory for the perfidy of falsehood. But that the Lord is indeed the crown of the church, Isaiah testifies, when he says, 'In that day the Lord of hosts shall be a crown of glory and a diadem of joy to the residue of His people' (Is. xxviii. 5). . . . Virtually the crown on our head vanishes, when His good-will is lost. In reference to which the Prophet sings in congratulatory strains, 'With the shield of Thy good-will Thou hast crowned us, O Lord,' Ps. v. 13 (12)." PASCHASIUS. [CALVIN: "By the crown of the head he no doubt understands all those ornaments, by which that people had been adorned. They had a kingdom and priesthood, which were like two luminaries or two precious jewels; they had also other things by which the Lord had adorned them. As, then, they were endued with such excellent things, they are said to have borne a crown on their head. But a crown was not only taken for a diadem,—it was also a symbol of joy and of honor; for not only kings then wore crowns, but men were crowned at weddings and feasts, at games also, and theatres. The Prophet, in a word, complains that though many ornaments did belong to the people, yet now they were denuded of them all: *The crown, he says, has fallen from our head.*"—"**We can use this plaint to-day, not inappropriately, with regard to the condition of the Roman empire; and that it may be restored, by Divine favor, to its integrity and splendor, we should devoutly pray.**" FÖRSTER.

16. Ver. 16. **The crown has fallen from our head.** "Here arises a question, How can this be reconciled with the promise or prophecy

of Jacob, in Gen. xlix. 10? . . . The Rabbins have given it as their opinion, that the prophecy of Jacob must be understood thus,—The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, until the king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar, comes, who will cast down the sceptre of Judah. To this we answer, firstly; That their banishment was only a punishment for an inconsiderably short time. . . . Again it happened, that after the Babylonish captivity they had again their own regent in their own country. . . . Besides, God so wonderfully ordered it, that in the midst of the Babylonish captivity this sceptre of Judah made itself plainly visible. Whereas Daniel and his companions, who were of the royal lineage, and also of the house of David, were not only elevated to high position at the Babylonian court, but Daniel was appointed at Babylon one of the chiefest princes over the whole land (Dan. iii.). . . . Add to this, that Jehoiachin, the king of Judah, must be raised up again from the dust, and honored and treated as a king." EGIN. HUNNIUS.

17. Ver. 16. [**Woe unto us, that we have sinned!** CALVIN: "When we are pressed down by adversities, Satan will excite us to sorrow, and at the same time hurry us on to rage, except this doctrine comes to our minds, that we have to do with God, who is a righteous Judge. For the knowledge of our sins will tame our pride, and also check all those clamorous complaints, which the unbelieving are wont to utter when they rise up against God. Our evils, then, ought to lead us to consider God's judgment and to confess our sins."—SCOTT: "As wasting wars, terrible famines, and heavy oppressions or persecutions come upon nations, for the sins of former and present generations, when their appointed measure of iniquity is filled up: so the accumulating sins of a man's whole life will be punished with tremendous vengeance at last; except he obtain an interest in Him, 'who bare our sins in His own body on the tree.' The wrath of God turns the sinner's mirth into mourning, his liberty into bondage, and his honor into disgrace: for this the crown is fallen from our heads, and woe unto us that we have sinned!"]

18. Ver. 17. "Rightly is the heart said to be made sorrowful on account of sin, because where iniquity takes possession of the heart and burdens it, it is no longer the habitation of the Holy Spirit; but the whole mind is obscured by the mist of sin, while the grace of the Most High Paraclete disdains to shed abroad its enlightening influences in that mind. For the Holy Spirit of knowledge flees from deception (*factum, i. e. ficturam, fraudem*), and wisdom will not enter a malevolent soul." RHABANUS, in GHISLER., p. 221.

19. Ver. 18. **The foxes walk upon it.**—"The same fate which Mount Zion formerly experienced, many Mount Zions, *i. e.* churches, experience to-day, which a few years ago were enthusiastically devoted to the Lutheran faith, but now, alas for their wretchedness! the foxes run about them destroying the vineyards (Cant. ii. 15)." FÖRSTER.

20. Vers. 19-21. "After Jeremiah has related copiously and in detail all his own sorrows and those of his people, he closes at last with a prayer, to be a lesson to us, that we should do likewise. And as Jeremiah did not permit him-

self to be deterred from prayer by his own sins and those of the people, which were more in number than the sands of the sea, nor frightened from it by the grievous wrath of God; so we also, neither on account of our sins, nor yet because of the wrath of God, should restrain prayer." *Würtemb. Summarien*.

21. Ver. 19. **Thou, O LORD, remainest forever.** "His is an eternal continuance. But that Being (*Esse*) which exists, is that Being (*Esse*), in which the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father exist, so that they have a common eternity and are essentially one forever." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 223. [FAUSSET: "(Ps. cii. 12). The perpetuity of God's rule over human affairs, however He may seem to let His people be oppressed for a time, is their ground of hope of restoration."—CALVIN: "When we fix our eyes on present things, we must necessarily vacillate, as there is nothing permanent in the world; and when adversities bring a cloud over our eyes, then faith in a manner vanishes, at least we are troubled and stand amazed. Now the remedy is, to raise up our eyes to God, for however confounded things may be in the world, yet He remains always the same. His truth may indeed be hidden from us, yet it remains in Him. In short, were the world to change and perish a hundred times, nothing could ever affect the immutability of God. There is, then, no doubt but that the Prophet wished to take courage and to raise himself up to a firm hope, when he exclaimed, 'Thou, O God, remainest forever.' By the word *sitting* or *remaining*, he doubtless meant that the world is governed by God. We know that God has no body, but the word *sitting* is to be taken metaphorically, for He is no God except He be the Judge of the world."]

22. Ver. 19. [**Thy throne from generation to generation.** CALVIN: "The throne of God designates the government of the world. But if God be the Judge of the world, then He doeth nothing, or suffereth nothing to be done, but according to His supreme wisdom and justice. . . . The throne of God is set in opposition to chance or uncertain changes which ungodly men dream of; for when they see things in great confusion in the world, they say that it is the wheel of fortune, they say that all things happen through blind fate. Then the Prophet, that he might not be cast down with the unbelieving, refers to the throne of God, and strengthens himself in this doctrine of true religion,—that God nevertheless *sits on this throne*, though things are thus confounded, though all things fluctuate; yea, even though storms and tempests mingle as it were heaven and earth together, yet God sits on His throne amid all these disturbances. However turbulent, then, all the elements may be, this derogates nothing from the righteous and perpetual judgment of God. This is the meaning of the words; and hence fruit and benefit may be easily gathered."]

23. Ver. 20. **Wherefore dost Thou forget us forever?** "Not that God could have lost the treasures of memory or of knowledge; but because He delays, on account of some hidden purpose, to render aid immediately, while He seems to condemn those who pray to Him and

offers no consolation to their hearts. . . . By reason of human frailty, the mind burdened with troubles thinks God forgetful. For forgetfulness closes the fountain of charity, quickly takes away the faculty of compassion, blunts the edge of the grace that is to be conferred, and does not allow immediate assistance to those who are placed in misery." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 224. [CALVIN: "He seems here to expostulate with God; but the faithful, even when they patiently bear their evils, and submit to God's scourges, do yet familiarly deposit their complaints in His bosom, and thus unburden themselves. We see that David prayed, and no doubt by the real impulse of the Spirit, and at the same time expostulated, 'Why dost Thou forget me perpetually?' Ps. xiii. 1. Nor is there a doubt but that the Prophet took this complaint from David. Let us, then, know, that though the faithful sometimes take this liberty of expostulating with God, yet they do not put off reverence, modesty, submission, or humility. For when the Prophet thus inquired why God should forever forget His people and forsake them, he no doubt relied on his own prophecies, which he knew had proceeded from God, and thus he deferred his hope until the end of the seventy years, for that time had been prefixed by God. But it was according to human judgment that he complained in his own person and in that of the faithful, that the affliction was long; nor is there a doubt but that he dictated this form of prayer to the faithful, that it might be retained after his death. He, then, formed this prayer, not only according to his own feeling, and for the direction of those of his own age; but his purpose was to supply the faithful with a prayer after his own death, so that they might flee to the mercy of God. We now, then, perceive how complaints of this kind ought to be understood, when the prophets asked 'How long?' as though they stimulated God to hasten the time; for it cannot be, when we are pressed down by many evils, but that we wish help to be accelerated; for faith does not wholly strip us of all cares and anxieties. But when we thus pray, let us remember that our times are at the will and in the hand of God, and that we ought not to hasten too much. It is, then, lawful for us on the one hand to ask God to hasten; but, on the other hand, we ought to check our impatience and wait until the suitable time comes. Both these things the Prophet no doubt joined together when he said, *Why shouldst Thou perpetually forget us and forsake us?*"]

24. Vers. 21, 22. "Since the people in their prayer longed so earnestly for their fatherland, that they might be permitted to return home again, we should take example from this, in what fashion we should yearn after the heavenly fatherland, out of which we have been driven by sin and transgression, and thrust into this empty Babylon of a sinful world. . . . In Ps. cxxvi. the unspeakably great joy is described, which the Jews will experience when they return again into their fatherland, out of the Babylonish house of slavery and imprisonment. . . . If the people of God so rejoiced and exulted with loud shouts of joy, over the return to their earthly fatherland, how much greater joy there will be, when the elect are actually in the great blessed

home-gathering, brought into the eternal, imperishable Jerusalem." Egid. HUNNIUS.

25. Ver. 21. "Whom the Lord hath converted, that one will assuredly be saved, 'but whom He hath despised, no man can correct,' Eccl. vii. 13 [Vulg.]. But when he says, Renew our days as from the beginning, he seems to ask this, that as from the beginning He made the first Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob devoted to Himself in the plenitude of their faith and love, that He would therefore make them [who offered this prayer] also faithful and devoted to Himself, by bestowing upon them the same gifts, which was promised to them in the advent of Elias, by the Prophet Malachi, as many think (Mal. iv. 5)." RHABANUS in GHISLER., p. 224.

26. Ver. 21. **Turn Thou us unto Thee.** "Except by grace no backslider can be converted; because it is of ourselves that we have fallen, but of God that we rise again." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 224. [HENRY: "They here pray for converting grace, to prepare and qualify them for mercy; *Turn us to Thee, O Lord.* This implies an acknowledgment of their own weakness and inability to turn themselves, and that the cause of their distance was in themselves. There is in our nature a bent to backslide from God, but no disposition to return to Him, till His grace works in us both to *will and to do.* So necessary is that grace, that we may truly say, *Turn us, or we shall wander endlessly;* and so powerful and effectual is that grace, that we may as truly say, *Turn us and we shall be turned;* for it is a day of Almighty power, in which God's people are made *willing and obedient.*"] **And we shall be turned.** "When we are converted, we are recalled to the beginning of renovation; but when that is attained, we will be renewed." PASCHASIUS in GHISLER., p. 224. **Renew our days as of old.** "God has been ready to change His sentence, if thou hadst been willing to change thy wickedness by penitence." AMBROSE on Luke, in FÖRSTER. [WILLIAM LOWTH: "Do Thou give us the grace of conversion and amendment, and then Thou wilt remove Thy heavy judgments, and restore us to that happiness and prosperity which we formerly enjoyed."]

27. Ver. 22. "He did not utter these words as if despairing of the salvation of his people, but that he might manifest his excessive grief on account of the prolonged humiliation and rejection of his nation. For he saw by the Spirit of prophecy, that the Jews themselves, at the advent of Christ, would not believe. . . . But of the ultimate conversion of his nation he entertained no doubt,—but believed most fully that in the seed of Abraham all the families of the earth would be blessed; in which universal promise themselves also are certainly comprehended." RHABANUS in GHISLER.

28. Ver. 22. "As long as we wander here in this world, we shall be called upon to observe the condition of the condemned and lost, and when we see it, we will indeed mourn over it. Yet the Church of Christ is everywhere to be found, if men seek her, and she triumphs over all death. In her also many ages perish; we shall mourn for her in time, but will be comforted in eternity, for our mother is that Jerusalem,

which is from above, which is free. She is eternal, and those who here suffer for sin and have comfort only in grace, they are citizens of that eternal city." DIEDRICH. [SCOTT: "Though we should mourn over the miseries of the world, and the low estate of the Church, yet the true Zion, to which believers are come, cannot be desolated, but remaineth for ever, even as the throne of our God in Heaven. This inheritance cannot be forfeited or alienated; nor can our mansions be possessed by strangers; or our relation to God, as espoused and adopted into His family, abrogated; or the liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free, taken from us; the freeness of our salvation, disannulled; or our joy and glorying in Christ, made void. Various tribulations may make our hearts faint and our eyes dim: but our way to the mercy-seat of our reconciled God still is open; and we may beseech Him not to forsake or forget us; and plead with Him to turn, and renew us more and more by His grace; that our hopes may revive and our consolations abound as in the days of old. For the eternal and unchangeable God will not utterly reject His Church or any true believer, whatever our trials, fears or lamentations may be. Let us then, in all our troubles, put our whole trust and confidence in His mercy; let us confess our sins, and pour out our hearts before Him; and let us watch against repinings or despondency, whatever we suffer, or witness of the troubles of our brethren; for this we surely know, that it shall be well in the event with all who trust, fear, love and serve the Lord."]

29. [Prayer. CALVIN: "Grant, Almighty God, that as Thou didst formerly execute judgment so severe on Thy people,—O grant, that these chastisements may at this day teach us to fear Thy Name, and also keep us in watchfulness and humility, and that we may so strive to pursue the course of our calling, that we may find that Thou art always our leader, that Thy hand is stretched forth to us, that Thy aid is ever ready for us, until, being at length gathered into Thy celestial kingdom, we shall enjoy that eternal life, which Thine only-begotten Son has obtained for us by His own blood. Amen."]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. Ver. 1. If we say, **Remember, O LORD, consider and behold**, this supposes that the Lord can, in some way, forget something or not see it. But in fact He is omniscient and omnipresent. If then He sometimes, in some way, seems not to know or to see something, this is to be regarded as a test (Prüfung) imposed upon us. He would then be awakened, as it were, He would be urged to think of these things and to look upon them. This reserve on the part of God has a twofold design. He would thereby, first of all, bring us to a knowledge of ourselves. For then only will we urge another, who will not hear us, with unceasing importunity, to render us assistance, when we find that we have not in ourselves, even with our utmost exertion, the means of relief. Secondly, God would thereby prove our faith. Compare the parables of the unjust Judge (Luke xviii. 2-8) and of the friend who knocks at midnight (Luke xi. 5-10). On

this text, therefore, a sermon might be preached with reference to *The wise purposes which God has in view, when He long closes His ears to our prayer.* He would by this means, 1. lead us to self-knowledge; 2. try the strength of our faith.

2. Vers. 1-7. These verses would afford a text, in times of severe chastisement by the hand of foreign enemies, for a sermon on the theme, *The cry of need of a people severely oppressed by an enemy.* 1. This is a cry justified by the facts (vers. 2-6). 2. A penitential cry (ver. 7). 3. A believing cry (ver. 1).

3. Vers. 8-16. On these verses also a sermon could be preached in the days of a great national calamity brought about by the oppression of the public enemy. The thought might be extracted from these verses, that the separate items of suffering correspond with the sins that have been perpetrated (*per quod quis peccat, per idem puniatur et ipse*, Wisdom of Sol. xi. 16). Theme: *The just judgments of God.* 1. What they consist in. 1. Because we allowed ourselves to be ruled by our sins, now servants rule over us. 2. Because we despised the bread of life, which was freely and generously proffered to us, we must ourselves seek, with great difficulty, to get our daily bread. 3. Because we hungered not after righteousness, we must now suffer great pain from bodily hunger. 4. Because we crucified not our lust and passions, our wives and daughters are become the victims of the lusts of others. 5. Because we honored not our old men and rulers, our Princes and Elders are now ill-treated by foreigners. 6. Because the youths and boys would not bear the easy yoke of the Lord, they must now bear the heavy yoke of our enemies. 7. Because old and young had been too much addicted to worldly pleasure, they must now relinquish all joy, even that which in itself is innocent and allowable (vers. 14, 15). 8. Because we have not striven after the crown of life, the crown of earthly honor is dashed from our head. II. Whereto they should excite us. 1. To genuine lamentation over our sins. 2. To believing invocation of Divine grace and mercy.

4. Vers. 15, 16. FÖRSTER remarks, "These verses afford material for an address to be delivered in a time of public mourning, or at the funeral of a prince or any man of illustrious merit in the commonwealth, either ecclesiastical or civil."

5. Vers. 17-22. In times of great internal or external distress of the church, these words would afford a text for a sermon, and the theme thence deduced is, *The complaint and consolation of the Church.* I. The complaint. 1. The cause of it (ver. 18). 2. The expression of it (ver. 17). II. The consolation. 1. The power of the Lord of the Church is not shaken. 2. He has not rejected His Church forever, but will re-establish it, (a) inwardly, (b) externally.

6. Vers. 21, 22, and iii. 24-26, preached upon by CUNO MAURICE ZIMMERMANN, when pastor in Döbeln; *How God the Lord renews His Church* 1. Behold with adoration and thanksgiving how He did it in the days of Luther. 2. Behold with rapture and obedience, how He does it in our day. In "My last six official sermons in Döbeln, in the year 1863." Leipzig, Teubner, 1864.



Date Due

MY 6 '57		
NO 20 '30		
JAN 8 '52		
OCT 27 '52		
JAN 17 '55		
FACULTY		
~~DEC 2 '59~~		
DEC 2 '59		
JAN 3 '62		
JAN 10 '62		
JAN 27 '62		
MAY 21 '68		



BS494 .L276 v.12 c.2
The book of the prophet Jeremiah.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00039 3936